THIRTY YEARS ON THE FIRING-LINE

S. M. MARTIN

Class BX 7321

Book .M3

Copyright No. _____

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.

Dr. S. M. Martin.

THIRTY YEARS ON THE FIRING-LINE

Shots from the Battery of Truth

Which have been somewhat effective against the entrenchments of sin, the follies of our day, and the errors of the religious world

BY
EVANGELIST SYLVESTER MITCHELL MARTIN, A.M., M.D.
SEATTLE

CINCINNATI
THE STANDARD PUBLISHING COMPANY

COPYRIGHT, 1920,
THE STANDARD PUBLISHING COMPANY

BX7321
.M3

JUN 18 1920

©CLA571335

no 1

CONTENTS

PAGE

FOREWORD 5

PERSONAL 7

INTRODUCTION 9

I

PERSONALITY IN EVANGELISM 11

II

SAFETY FIRST 17

III

LOVE'S TRIUMPH 25

IV

ARE YOU FIT TO LIVE? 34

V

WHAT CHURCH SHALL I JOIN? 50

VI

CHRISTIAN UNION AND THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST 60

VII

THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST 70

CONTENTS

VIII

What Is Religion? 85

IX

The Christian and His Diseases 95

X

Infant Baptism 103

XI

What Is Baptism? 117

XII

The Communion, or the Lord's Supper 129

XIII

Opportunity 141

XIV

Marriage and Divorce 155

XV

Christian Science a Fraud, and Mrs. Eddy an "Antichrist" 169

XVI

The Second Coming of Christ and the End of the World 195

Some Questions Asked and Answered in Revival Meetings 211

FOREWORD

PAINFULLY aware of my limitations, yet joyously conscious that God has used me as one of the "weak things of this world" in blessing many by the preaching of the gospel through an uninterrupted period of more than thirty years of continuous evangelism, and having been urged to leave some of my discourses in permanent form, I have at last gotten my own reluctant consent to undertake the task, and herewith present the result.

PERSONAL

I WAS born near Antioch, Monroe County, Ohio, August 16, 1857. *"Born again"* on August 23, 1875, at Stafford, Ohio. My first birth might have been nothing short of a calamity had it not been for the second. My father was Enoch Martin; my mother, Nancy Huffman Martin. I have one brother, Roseberry A. Martin, of Los Angeles, California. I was married December 23, 1876, to "Mary" Catharine Barnes, of Summerfield, Ohio. Our three children—*"the girls"*—are "Nina," "Lela" and "Minnie." We have four grandsons; viz., Charles Martin Hatcher, Richard Martin Thatcher, Robert Martin Shuey and Franklin Martin Shuey.

I was ordained to the ministry by the church at Bowling Green, Missouri, on the 19th of July, 1885, having been a teacher for thirteen years, and for the next two years I combined the two professions.

In the spring of 1888 I was called to be the State evangelist of Missouri, beginning the work April 24, and continuing until July 1, 1891, at which time I entered the field as an independent general evangelist of the churches of Christ.

INTRODUCTION

THE outstanding *personnel* of a great movement is always interesting. Who originated it? Who carried it on to success? These are among the questions the historian asks.

The Restoration movement has already acquired a large place in religious history, and its phenomenal growth and influence will interest future historians tremendously.

The names of influential men will shine in the history of each period of the movement to restore apostolic Christianity, and among them will be the name of S. M. Martin. For thirty years he has served continuously as an evangelist in the field, and the great meetings he has held have left an impress which time will not erase.

This eloquent preacher is not yet an old man—he is in the prime of life, and is still in country-wide demand. He is ever "booked up" a year or more, and wherever he goes the crowds gather and the community is stirred.

S. M. Martin has never been known to put on the "soft pedal," nor has he delivered the Restoration message in a way that repelled. In choice language and with eloquent tongue he has pro-

claimed the gospel in the spirit of love. Hence, the great success which has attended his ministry.

For years his friends have urged him to have a few of his great sermons preserved in book form. When, some years ago, he held a meeting for me in Columbus, O., I insisted that he should issue a book of sermons. He suggested that he might—some day.

He finally decided the matter and requested me to write a brief introduction to the book. Having heard the sermons presented in this volume delivered, and having also read them in manuscript, I can most heartily commend them as messages that should be read by every disciple of Christ in the land. They are entertaining and instructive, and they will therefore be doubly profitable to the reader. The book will likewise be valuable to lend to one's neighbor, whether he be an inquiring believer or a man of the world.

GEO. P. RUTLEDGE.

CINCINNATI, O., Feb. 27, 1920.

I

PERSONALITY IN EVANGELISM

A STRONG personality has always been regarded as a very important factor in the equipment of a successful evangelist. He should possess those characteristics which challenge the attention instantly, and impress favorably and strongly. He thus secures predisposition in favor of his message. Personality is merely the sum total of those qualities of body, mind and spirit which stand out prominently, and tend to predispose the hearer in favor of the speaker and assure a more favorable consideration of his message.

Natural characteristics may be advantageous or otherwise. If unfavorable, they should be counteracted as far as possible, and all natural endowments should be supplemented by every acquired grace and accomplishment.

Even the most attractive people will not be attractive to everybody, while the least attractive will be able to impress some people favorably.

The more nearly one approaches to mental, moral, physical and spiritual perfection, the

stronger will be the personality; and glaring defects in any one or all of these particulars, will weaken the personality correspondingly.

Physical endowments are first noticed, then mental accomplishments will be flashed upon the attention, followed by a discernment of the moral qualities; and lastly the spirituality of the individual will be in evidence. Real spirituality is never obtrusive, and that person whose religion is always painful to other people, lacks both spirituality and mentality.

Most of the great union evangelists have been men of striking physique; *e. g.,* Moody, Chapman, Torrey and Gipsy Smith.

The same is true of our own evangelists. I do not mean that they are handsome men, though some of them are that. But they are strong, healthy, even athletic men, and have good bodies, and are thus able to stand the greatest amount of effectual labor. The demands on the physical strength of the evangelist are very great.

As far as possible, the evangelist should be free from offensive mannerisms, and all habits of doubtful propriety, such as the use of tobacco and other narcotics. A fine, commanding, attractive physique is exceedingly advantageous. But where one is not possessed of such a presence, then superior mental accomplishments may largely compensate for the defect. Physical and mental endowments supplement each other, and each renders the other

more effectual. Personal influence is often called "personal magnetism." The expression is often heard: "Christ alone can save, but Christ can not save alone." We might also say: "We alone can save ourselves, but we can not save ourselves alone." We are workers together with Christ in our own salvation and in the salvation of others. The preaching of the gospel is committed unto men, not to angels. "It pleased God by the foolishness [simplicity] of preaching to save them that believe" (1 Cor. 1:21). Strong personality increases the effectiveness of our preaching.

Magnetism is that force or power in nature which gives rise to the phenomena of attraction.

This power was first noticed in protoxide, or octohedral iron—natural magnetic iron ore. Artificial magnets are now made which are capable of lifting forty thousand pounds at one time when charged with a powerful current of electricity.

Magnetism exerts its power by *attraction,* while steam and gasoline are *repulsive forces.*

The work and transforming power of the gospel are accomplished by *attraction.* Christ says: "If I be lifted up, I will *draw* all men unto me" (John 12:32). People are attractive, or magnetic, when they are Christlike. We must be magnetized by having "Christ in us the hope of glory."

The force and value of a great magnet depend upon the proper treatment of the metal of which it is made. The same is true of the religious

force of men and women. Even at the best, we have our limitations; so has the most powerful magnet. The most powerful evangelist will not be able to attract and convert all who hear him. Paul says: "But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the *power* may be of God, and not of us."

God's power to save is the gospel. Satan's power to destroy is anything that opposes or renders the gospel ineffective.

As the gospel is applied through us, whatever will increase our personal influence will render the gospel more effectual as a drawing, rescuing, saving power.

This gospel current is conveyed to the world very largely through evangelistic effort, hence we should have such training and equipment as will make us the most powerful in drawing people to Christ.

Certain rules have been formulated by writers on the subject of personal magnetism, the observance of which has been found to greatly augment the personal force or attractiveness of the individual. I will note some of these rules: (1) Cheerfulness; (2) gentleness; (3) self-control, coolness; (4) a steady eye; (5) courage; (6) perfect mastery of temper; (7) a pleasing, modulated voice; (8) personal neatness and cleanliness; (9) good health (or no complaint of illness); (10) politeness; (11) work, work, work; (12) charity for all.

The application of these rules will give one power over others for either good or evil, being merely personal qualities which render their possessor attractive, or influential. If the possessor is a sinner, he will be an influential sinner, but if he is a Christian, he will have much power in leading people to Christ.

The Christian's power will be in proportion to his faith in God, and his faithfulness in service, adding the above rules.

There are very few people who are so perfectly and harmoniously developed as to show no defects, especially to those who are most intimately associated with them. It is these flaws and defects which "get on our nerves," and when we get on people's nerves, we have lost our magnetism so far as they are concerned.

The personal element, or mere personal regard, must never be used to induce people to merely join the church in order to please the preacher. It should be used only to forcefully apply the divine message, which is the saving power. Some people exert their power spasmodically, like a broken trolley-wire, writhing, twisting, spitting fire and producing consternation, and even death. They seem to burn out the transformer, or the fuse! We should be earnest and constant, a dependable force, and not erratic fanatics!

Self-indulgent, unconsecrated disciples do not attract people to Christ. They are *demagnetized.*

The unconverted sinner has a very high ideal as to how a Christian ought to live, and of how he, himself, is going to live when he joins the church. A young lady, a member of the church, went to talk to a young gentleman of her acquaintance on the subject of his becoming a Christian. He listened rather impatiently for a few minutes, and then said: "See here, Jennie, you are not the one to talk to me." She asked, "Why?" and he replied: "I've seen you too often in the ballroom, and I don't think that's any place for a Christian to go." The ballroom had *demagnetized* her so that she had no influence to bring the young man to Christ.

Occasionally there is found one whose personality is so strong, and whose influence is so transcendent, as to provoke wonder and amazement. They become great leaders, and are accused of hypnotism, or are accredited with supernatural powers. Illustrations will readily occur to my readers. We should never allow the strong personality of the messenger to obscure the person of Christ, or the message of salvation, and neither men nor angels should take honor or glory, which belongs to God alone. "And I fell at his feet to worship him. And he said unto me, See thou do it not: I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus: worship God" (Rev. 19:10).

II

SAFETY FIRST

TEXT.—"Sirs, what must I do to be saved?"—Acts 16: 30.

THIS is the greatest question ever asked by human lips, and the greatest one that Heaven has ever condescended to answer.

"In all cases of doubt and uncertainty the safe course must be taken, and no risks run" ("Guide to Railroad Employees").

An employee of the Gulf Road, the day after he had obeyed the gospel, handed me a slip of paper upon which were written the above words. He said: "I have never violated that rule as a railroad man, and no accident has ever been traceable to me, but I have been more faithful to the railroad than to myself, and I decided last night to run no more risks with my soul."

There are thirty-four thousand persons killed on the railroads in this country every twelve months, or one every fifteen minutes. Twenty-five thousand of these are due to the violation of that one rule. We should certainly be as cautious in matters pertaining to the soul as in those pertain-

ing to ordinary business. Why take risks when there is an *absolutely safe course?* Life here has a limit; that beyond has none, hence the importance of being safe in our religion.

We shall not attempt to settle the many controverted points of religion any further than to show an honest, conscientious person what is *absolutely safe* in any event, and "Safety First" will point the way. We make but one trip.

Faith versus Unbelief.

The believer risks nothing if there is nothing to lose. Infidelity takes away everything and gives you nothing. It knows nothing, believes nothing, promises nothing, hopes for nothing.

Mr. Campbell, in his introduction of the debate with Robert Owen, the world champion of infidelity, in 1829, said: "Infidelity, as opposed to Christianity, is not an institution, but a mere negation of an institution, and of the facts and documents on which it is founded. It has no essential formal existence. It has no facts and documents, and therefore it has no proofs. It merely assails Christianity, but offers no substitute for it, and it has none to offer."

John A. Bingham, of Ohio, once said to Mr. Ingersoll: "Robert, if you are right and I am wrong, neither of us will ever know it; but if I am right and you are wrong, I shall be conscious of it, and so will you, throughout eternity."

It is always safe to hold to what you have until you find something better.

When Ingersoll was to lecture in Little Rock in 1898, a drunken Irishman said to me: "You preachers is afther Bob, and I'm on your side, for if Bob's right, the preacher is safe, but if the preacher is right, Bob's in a bad fix!" If Christianity is true, then "he that believeth not shall be damned," and the infidel runs the risk; the faithful Christian is safe.

Universalism versus Orthodoxy.

Universalism is very broad and liberal. It demands nothing of saint or sinner, but promises salvation to both. If *all* are to be saved, the Christian will be included, and is *safe* in spite of his Christianity; but if the Christian only is safe, then the Universalist is lost for lack of Christianity. Universalism is a risk; Christianity is safe.

Baptism versus No Baptism.

Is baptism (in water) essential? I do not need to know. You do not need to know. John Wesley said: "*God has bound us to it, though he may not have bound himself.*" So, you attend to it, and you will be safe. You know it is one of God's commands; it is safe to obey, and unsafe to disobey.

Those who are baptized do right, and those who do right are safe. The unbaptized occupy the unsafe ground; the baptized occupy the safe ground, and that is what we are searching for.

Immersion versus Sprinkling and Pouring.

Even when the safety and importance of baptism are conceded, the question arises, What *is* baptism? Is it immersion only, or is it also sprinkling and pouring? Here again we answer, You do not need to know. Just select the form of baptism which is not in doubt, and has never been in question, and you will be safe.

John Calvin says: "It is certain that immersion was the practice of the ancient church. The very word 'baptize' signifies 'to immerse'" ("Institutes," Book IV., Ch. XV., Sec. 19).

Philip Schaff says. "Immersion, and not sprinkling, was unquestionably the original normal form" ("History of the Apostolic Church," pp. 568, 569).

Joseph Henry Thayer—"Harvard University" Lexicon—says: "Christian baptism—this. according to the view of the apostles, is a rite of sacred immersion commanded by Christ." The real scholars of the world teach and affirm that immersion was the primitive, apostolic baptism.

Jesus was baptized but *once,* hence but *one* way. Were you baptized as He was? Paul says: "We were *buried with him* in baptism." If I owed you $20, and I tendered you in payment a $20 gold coin, and my personal note for $20, and your pastor's note for $20 with my endorsement, which would you accept? Ah, the $20 gold coin, of

course! My note may be good, your pastor's note may be even better, but you are absolutely safe in taking the coin, for it *is* money, and the notes are substitutes for money. Immersion is baptism, while sprinkling and pouring are substitutes for it. They may pass, but it is a risk. Christ commanded baptism, and practiced immersion.

The Pope substituted pouring for immersion. John Calvin substituted sprinkling for pouring (says Dr. Wall). Each of these endorses the other, both endorse Christ's immersion, while Christ endorses neither of these substitutes.

Jesus was baptized "*into the Jordan*" (*eis ton Jordanen*), and all the persons of the Godhead witnessed and participated in it.

Jesus said: "Suffer it to be so now." The Father said: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." The Spirit descended as a dove and abode upon him. Baptism is the only thing which is commanded to be done in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Here is where the entire name of the Godhead is recorded. As God's name was recorded in Jerusalem, and there the Passover was kept, and there God met to bless the children of Israel (see Deut. 16:16; 2 Chron. 6:6; 12:13), so he meets us here when we are baptized into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. It is certainly safe to be baptized (immersed), and unsafe to refuse or neglect it, or substitute anything else for it.

THE NAME "CHRISTIAN" VERSUS OTHER NAMES.

Some names are important, others are not. The importance of a name depends upon what it represents. "The disciples were called Christians first at Antioch" (Acts 11:26). Whether this name was given in derision by their enemies, or by the Holy Spirit (as I believe), it was most appropriate. "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named" (Eph. 3:14, 15).

A. J. Gordon ("Ministry of the Spirit," p. 206) says: "It was not by accident or as a term of derision that the first believers received their name, but the disciples were divinely called Christians first at Antioch." This was the name preordained for them—that "honorable name by which ye are called" (Jas. 2:7). John Wesley said: "Would to God that all party names and unscriptural phrases and forms were forgot." Albert Barnes says: "Should not, and will not, all these divisions yet be merged into the high and holy name 'Christian'?" Henry Ward Beecher once said at the communion table: "Let me speak the language of heaven and call you simply 'Christians.'"

Christ is the Bridegroom; the church is the Bride. You would not want your wife to wear some other man's name as long as you are living.

"The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord" (1 Cor. 7:39). But Jesus is not dead, and we are not at liberty to be married to any other, or to wear any other man's name, such as Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Campbell, Methodist, Baptist or Presbyterian.

Four years after the death of my father, my mother married a good Christian man, as she had a Scriptural right to do, but it never did seem just right to me to hear my mother called by any other name than Martin—though in this case it was right, for my father was dead. But it is not right to put some other name where the name of our *living* Lord belongs. No name is good enough to be substituted for His, and I protest against it. I love and honor Luther, Calvin, Wesley and Campbell, but neither of them is my Saviour; neither of them shed his blood or died for me. I will not, I must not, wear their names, not even jokingly; it is too serious for that.

But some one asks: "What right have you to the name 'Christian,' or to say you belong to the church of Christ, or church of God?" I answer: "No exclusive right, but merely the same right that any saved person has. I merely deny to myself, and to all others, the right to wear any other name, or names, than those given in the Book of God." "The Lord added to the church, day by

day, those that were being saved'' (Acts 2:47). It is absolutely safe to believe in Jesus Christ as the Son of God; to repent (for ''God now commandeth all men everywhere to repent''); to confess Him before men (''If you confess him, he will confess you, but if you deny him, he will deny you''); to be baptized (immersed) into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, to wear His name, and to be faithful unto the end, for ''he that endureth unto the end shall be saved.''

III

LOVE'S TRIUMPH

TEXTS.—"Now thanks be unto God, which always causeth us to triumph in Christ."—2 Cor. 2: 14.

"And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity" (or love).—1 Cor. 13: 13.

GOD loved us while we were yet sinners, and sent Christ, who also loved us and gave Himself for us, and "we love him because he first loved us." Salvation is love's triumph, *beginning, middle* and *ending.*

But triumph implies enemies. If we gain a triumph, it must be over something that is against us. The Christian has enemies, and these are classified in the Bible as the *world,* the *flesh* and the *devil.* I sometimes call these the "trinity of hell." These all lead to one result, and that is *sin,* "and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." John says: "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him" (1 John 2: 15). It is all right for Christians to be in the world, because the world needs them in order to

give it light and salvation, but it is all wrong when the world gets into the Christian!

The *flesh* is another enemy. Gal. 5:17: "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." Also read Rom. 7:15-25.

It is not possible to convert the flesh. The flesh can not obey God. But the mind is converted, and with that we serve God, and with the mind we control the flesh through the Spirit. "So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin" (Rom. 7:25). "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" (Rom. 8:1).

The *devil* is the third of these enemies. 1 Pet. 5:8: "Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour."

These enemies are all aggressive; we do not have to go out and hunt for them. We are in the flesh, and in the world, and the devil seems to be in many of us!

But whether we are controlled by the world, the flesh or the devil, the result is *sin, sin, sin!*

So we must triumph over *sin.* There are three things about sin over which we must triumph. They are: (1) The *love* of *sin;* (2) the *power* of *sin;* (3) the *guilt* of *sin.*

We overcome the *love of sin* by the *change of heart;* this is brought about by faith.

We overcome the *power of sin* by that reformation of life which is brought about by repentance.

We overcome the *guilt of sin* through *pardon,* when we are baptized. See Acts 2:38 and Acts 22:16.

The next enemy we must triumph over is the grave, and that will be in the resurrection.

The last enemy to be overcome is the second death, or the lake of fire, which follows the great judgment-day. If our names are written in the Lamb's Book of life, He will confess us there, and all danger will be past, all enemies overcome forever. "Now thanks be unto God, which always causeth us to triumph in Christ."

How thankful we should be, and how full of rejoicing, yet many of us never say anything about it. The victories we have in Christ ought to set "the joy-bells ringing"! We ought to shout and sing our gratitude, and tell our love for Him. Do you love the Saviour? Then say so.

Some men never tell their wives that they love them. They should do so, for there never was a woman who was not made happier and better by kind, loving words of appreciation from her husband. George Eliot says: "I like not only to be loved, but to be told that I am loved; the realm of silence is large enough beyond the grave." And there never was a man so mean, careless, hard-

hearted and hateful that he could not be touched by a "little bit of love."

Parents, do you love your children? Of course you do, but do you tell them so? This is the great mistake which many parents make. It was the mistake made by my own father, as the following will show: Friends have told me that I was considered a pretty bad boy—not vicious or wicked, but one of the mischievous, nerve-wrecking kind. My father evidently shared fully in this opinion, and his frequent efforts for my correction were *painful*—extremely so. I came to believe that father and I were never intended for each other. I remember wondering if I had not been an orphan boy adopted by my parents. I was nearing my fourteenth birthday. From my earliest recollection I had been whipped unmercifully for what I now regard as trivial offenses—things for which children are but mildly reprimanded these days. I look back to those days with bitterness, but I do not censure my father. He knew no better, and was himself the victim of circumstances, which in turn made me the victim of the *unspared* rod. *My* father was *his* father's oldest son, and became a schoolteacher about the time his two younger brothers were born. He was the teacher of his own brothers and sisters, of whom there were eight. My grandparents delegated to him the control and discipline of the children at home as well as at school, and it was no unusual thing for him to

punish them any time, anywhere. I was my father's oldest son, and the first grandson. Two of my uncles were only five and seven years older than myself. *I think I was spoiled,* and of course my father must punish me for even slight offenses, to justify the tight rein he held over his brothers and sisters. They feared him, and so did I. As I grew older, my whippings grew more severe and dreadful. As already mentioned, I was nearing my fourteenth birthday—a lusty boy, with big bare feet. Father was easily provoked, and I was always running foul of his temper. He could not bear to be contradicted, and contradiction was my fatal weakness. I had escaped whipping for some time, when, one day, I happened to contradict a statement he had made to some one in my presence. His face flushed like fire, and I knew a storm was coming! He ordered me to an unoccupied apartment, to await an interview with him. I retired to the room, closed the door and proceeded to get very angry. *I resolved he should never whip me again,* and, should he attempt it, as I expected him to do, *I would fight!* Oh, how wicked! (I was not a Christian then, not until five years later.) I waited some minutes, then the door opened and he entered. I was standing. The psychological moment had come. To my surprise, he was not angry or excited. He asked me to sit down and he sat down close, facing me. He began to talk to me mildly, kindly, tenderly. I was dumb with amaze-

ment! It had never been so before. What did it all mean? Was I dreaming? Then, with his big blue eyes full of tears, he said, for the first time in *my* life: "Yes, I love you, and it hurts me for you to do wrong." I was speechless; a big lump had been rising in my throat, and now it seemed I must choke. I burst into sobs, and promised not to contradict him any more, and asked his forgiveness. I told him I didn't know he loved me; that I thought he hated me, and would be glad if I were dead, and that I had always thought so. When he asked how and why I could think such awful things, I told him of how he had beaten me all my life, but never, never before had he said *he loved me.* From that day until his death all was changed. I had found my father's heart and he had found mine. Oh, how we loved each other! His love had saved me, saved us both.

Many children are heart-hungry. It may be yours. A father, who was away from home much of the time, had several children, the youngest a little girl some five years old. One day he had some work requiring his undisturbed attention. He asked "mamma" to keep the baby away from his room for a time, but the child eluded the vigilance of mother and got into her father's presence —not once, but twice, and then a third time— when he scolded her and threatened to punish her if she bothered him any more. As she left the room she stopped at the door and said: "Papa,

do you love your little girl?" "Why, yes, of course papa loves you, but you must not bother me when I am busy." As she closed the door she said: "*Well, if you love me, den I like to hear you say so sometimes.*" That's it! they like to hear us say so sometimes. I've had my children to ask me a dozen times a day if I loved them. They just liked to hear me say so! And parents like to hear the children say, "I love you, papa;" "I love you, mamma." And when you write a letter to them, don't fail to write those precious words, "*I love you.*"

I don't think the "Prodigal Son" knew that his father loved him, and that's one chief reason the boy wanted to get away—seeking for love. If he had known there was more love at home than anywhere else, he would have remained there. Boys and girls will not run away from homes where love is outspoken. An only daughter of a rich widow in London, tiring of the restraint of an exacting mother, ran away from home. All efforts to find the daughter were unavailing. Years passed. The mother was broken-hearted. The daughter, having concealed her identity, was without means and friends, and she fell into sin, and went down, down, down! But the mother heart went out after her, and a message was posted—a picture of the mother, below which were the words: "Mother loves you, daughter; come home." The wretched girl saw the picture—it was her mother! She read

the words. "Oh, can it be? Does mother love me?" She had never heard those words before. "Yet that is mother's picture, and I am her only child. It must mean me! Ah, she does not know what I am now. Her love is for her ideal daughter, not this real one! She does not want me to come home."

But the message kept ringing in her heart, and wherever she looked she saw the picture and read the precious message, "*Daughter, come home.*" So in the darkness of the night she wended her way to the mansion of her mother. She stood on the opposite side of the street and looked longingly at what had once been her unhappy home, but she thought of mother and the words "I love you." She crossed over and entered the gate. The night is cold and damp. She walks slowly towards the house, but has no intention of entering it. She is thinking, thinking of the past. Her heart beats fast. She reaches the door—that old familiar door; she puts her trembling hand on the latch—and, horror! it opens, and a watchman is there and demands an explanation of her presence. She begs to be allowed to go quietly away, protesting that she meant no harm. But her appearance and the lateness of the hour are against her. At last she explains that this was once her home; that she is the poor, unfortunate daughter of the owner of the place. "Then, I can not let you go. This door has never been locked since you went away, and a

watchman is kept here night and day to welcome you should you return. We must call your mother; she has waited for you long."

Love's message had drawn the wanderer back, and love's welcome was awaiting her. It is so with the sinner to-day. "We love him because he first loved us," and "the goodness of God leadeth us to repentance."

God loves us and has told us so, and He wants us to love Him with all our mind and strength, and *to tell Him so.* Jesus says: "If you love me, keep my commandments." "For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments."

IV

ARE YOU FIT TO LIVE?

TEXT.—"Prepare to meet thy God."—Amos 4: 12.

THESE are words of awful solemnity, and should arouse every one to immediate action. *No one is fit to live, until he is prepared to die.* The Christian life not only prepares one for heaven, but it fits him for this earth. The sinner's influence is bad, and he is a detriment and a curse to the world just as long as he lives in sin. I am anxious to get people fitted to live, and then I know they will be all right when it comes to death.

There are two specific, direct and unavoidable interviews which must and will take place between every man and his God. The first of these is at death: "It is appointed unto men once to die" (Heb. 9:27). "When the body returns to dust, the spirit returns to God who gave it" (Eccl. 12:7). "Absent from the body, present with the Lord" (2 Cor. 5:8).

The second is at the judgment: "But after this the judgment" (Heb. 9:27). "We shall all stand

before the judgment-seat of Christ. . . . So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God" (Rom. 14:10, 12). "For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil" (Eccl. 12:14). "The Lord shall judge his people" (Heb. 10:30).

There are three words that have a remarkable relation to each other. They are *ability, responsibility, accountability.* Each one grows directly out of the other. If we have *ability,* we are *responsible.* If we are *responsible,* we must render an *account.* But to render an account is to come to judgment. But judgment means to come before a superior tribunal for approval or disapproval, reward or punishment. Ability and responsibility would amount to nothing if there were no accountability. Hence the importance of preparing to meet God in judgment, and being able "to render an account for the deeds done in the body."

How prepare? It will be necessary to find out what is wrong. A correct diagnosis must precede rational treatment. Man has made an awful mess of trying to treat himself. At best, man is a "quack doctor" when it comes to matters of the soul. It is easier to get sick than it is to get well. It is easier to fall than it is to get up. Man got into the pit with a little help from Satan, but he needs a great deal of help to get out! His efforts to treat himself for his "malady of unpre-

paredness to meet his God" have been provoking, pathetic or amusing, but always ineffectual.

There are four principal ways in which he has attempted this preparation. First by *education,* whatever that may mean, for there is great confusion here. It has been taught that a developed intellect will be able to project itself into the future state, and successfully meet all conditions found there. It is the practice of "Yoga," or "the path that leads to wisdom"; "Brahma-gnana, or divine wisdom; idealized intelligence." It is simply paganism or Hinduism which is being introduced into America, and it has very much in common with the worship of Moloch and Baal by the ancient Assyrian idolaters. There is a Buddhist temple in Seattle, a Hindoo temple in San Francisco, a Krishna temple in Los Angeles and a Theosophical temple at San Diego. And many wealthy American women are taking up with these "abominations unto the Lord."

The second effort at preparation has been *morality,* or *ethical culture.* If mere morality is enough to save a man from condemnation at the last judgment, then a man can save himself, because if you are moral you have made yourself so, and if you are immoral you have made yourself immoral. Your morality and immorality is a work of your own. If a man makes himself moral and that will save him, then he does not need God; he saves himself! But not one of you is perfectly moral;

all have fallen short of perfection in morals, and not until you can lift yourself over the fence by pulling on your own boot-straps will you be able to save yourself without assistance!

A third way is by *penance*—self-inflicted punishment or torture. There are millions of human beings who serve their gods in this way. They lacerate their flesh, and then tear open the healing wounds. They take long journeys, pilgrimages, and deny themselves food, drink and shelter. They crawl and walk on their knees long distances, allow themselves to be bitten by poisonous insects, cut off their ears, put out their eyes, pull out teeth, pull off nails, and whip and scourge and torture themselves in every conceivable way, thus rendering their bodies sick and sore, hideous and miserable. Does this self-inflicted punishment prepare people to meet God? Is a man unprepared to meet God because he is well and physically sound? If so, we would better all get sick immediately.

We have a little of this self-inflicted punishment in this country—people who abstain from certain kinds of food on certain days of the week, or for certain seasons. The Bible does not command it. Nowhere in the New Testament, which is our law-book, do you find where you are commanded to abstain from meat on Friday or during Lent. The Bible doesn't know anything about Lent. It would be all right if the Lord had commanded it, but it is commanded by men, and not

by the Lord. Away with all these doctrines, traditions, commandments and ordinances of men! Paul says all are to perish with the using. (See Col. 2:20-23.)

Our physical health, whether good or bad, does not determine our preparedness to meet God. Some healthy people are very good, and some sick ones are very bad, and *vice versa.* The physical condition of the body has nothing to do with the condition of the soul.

The fourth method of treatment is just to *deny it!* Persistently affirm that there is nothing the matter. That you are not unprepared to meet God. Hypnotize yourself into believing there is no unpreparedness, and that you are ready to meet God, and there is nothing to fear. All is mind, and mind is God—and man is God, so he only has to meet himself after all! If you are sick, that is just a mistake of your mortal mind, but as all mind is God, and God is all, then it must be God who makes the mistake of thinking He is sick! But who can follow the ramifications or the absurdities and contradictions of Christian Science?

There was one of these moonshine doctors out in California who was called to treat a little boy who had "fits." He took the child on his knee and said: "Now you must repeat just what I say."

Doctor—"There are no fits."

Boy—"There are no fits" (in a thin, piping voice).

Doctor—"There never were any fits."
Boy—"There never were any fits."
Doctor—"Nobody ever had a fit."
Boy—"Nobody ever had a fit."
Doctor—"I never had a fit."
Boy—"I never had a fit."
Doctor—"I never will have a fit."
Boy—"I never will—wow! I'm goin' to have one now! Wow! wow!"

And he had one too! At least, even the doctor's mortal mind got twisted until he thought the boy had something. Now, this was a real occurrence. These people who call themselves Christian Scientists absolutely and positively deny every fundamental doctrine of the religion of Jesus Christ.

These four methods of treatment remind me of an incident told me down at Little Rock, Arkansas. A man living near the city got a fall and was hurt quite severely. They sent for the doctor, and in the meantime an old colored man, a sort of "root and herb doctor" amongst the negroes, was called in and asked if he could relieve the man until the doctor should come. He fixed up a dose and gave it to the man; shortly afterwards the doctor came. They told him that the colored man had just given him a dose of medicine, and the doctor asked what had been given. He replied that he had given him a dose of "alum and rosum," and explained that as the man had gotten a fall he thought "he had done wrenched himself," so he gave the *alum* to

draw the parts together, and the *"rosum"* to "stick 'em tight." This is quite as intelligent and effectual as are man-made religions.

Christ says: "In vain do they worship me teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men" (Mark 7:7). Man is a spiritual quack doctor. We shall now dismiss him and call in the great Physician, the Lord Jesus Christ. His diagnosis is given in one word: "Sin!" This is induced by the *heart,* the *life* and the *state* of the individual being wrong. As long as the *heart,* the *life* and the *state* are wrong, *sin* will be the result. Hence the *heart, life* and *state* must be changed. There is no use to forgive the sinner and leave him in a sinful state. In other words, pardon would avail nothing without conversion. Conversion is the change which takes place in the mind and heart of a person in becoming a Christian. Pardon is an official act and takes place in the mind of God. In conversion, man acts; in pardon, God acts. Jesus tells us what will bring about the change of heart, life and state which is necessary in order to secure the pardon of our past sins.

1. *Change of Heart.* What is the heart? So few people know what the heart is. A woman once said to me: "I think all you have to do is to get the heart right." I said: "Madam, what is the heart?" She floundered around and finally said, "I must confess, I really can't tell what it is," and I replied, "You think all that is necessary is

to get the heart right, and you don't know what it is." So, people go around talking about "the heart, the heart," and they wouldn't know a heart from a gizzard without a label on it. Now, I'll tell you what *the heart* is: It consists of the *intellect, emotions* and *will.* Or, as some give it, thus: the understanding, the judgment, the affections, the conscience and the will. These put together constitute the whole heart, and any one or more of them being wrong puts the heart out of fix. When speaking of the heart we may mean any one, or more, or all of the above. It is thus used in the Bible.

The sinner's heart *must be changed,* and this is *done by* FAITH. "He [God] put no difference between us [Jews] and them [Gentiles], purifying their hearts by [the] faith" (Acts 15:9). Carefully note the following Scriptures:

"Without faith it is impossible to please him" (Heb. 11:6).

"He that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark 16:16).

We might quote many other passages proving the necessity of faith.

The change of heart is produced by faith, and Paul says: "Faith comes by hearing the word of God." It will consist in

1. The enlightenment of the understanding.
2. The conviction of the judgment.
3. The purifying of the affections.

4. The quickening of the conscience.

5. The subjection of the will to God.

When the above changes take place under the influence of the gospel, which is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, the next change will immediately follow, which is repentance.

I hope you thoroughly comprehend what I have said about the change of heart. There are so many people who don't know the difference between a change of heart and a sensation in the nervous system. They have some emotional experience without understanding, conscience or judgment, and they think that is a change of heart. Mere emotional excitement is not a change of heart. There is need of much emphasis here. The heart is changed only when the *understanding* has been enlightened by the word of God, and the judgment has been convicted by its truth, and the affections have been purified (so that we love what God loves, and will hate what God hates), and the conscience is made tender by the recognition of His message of love, and the human will submits to that of God.

2. *Change of Life.* This means repentance. It is from the Greek word *metanoea.* "It is that sorrow for sin which produces newness of life" (Buck). "It is the relinquishment of any practice from the conviction that it has offended God" (Webster).

Such a change of conduct or life is necessary before we can secure pardon, or gain the *state of reconciliation to God.*

Luke says (24:47): "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."

"Repent and be baptized" (Acts 2:38).

"I tell you, Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish" (Luke 13:3).

As there are only three things that can possibly be wrong with even the worst sinner—namely, his *heart,* his *life* and his *state* (or *relation to God*)—when we get these right, we will have him saved, or prepared to meet his God. Faith makes the heart right, repentance makes the life right. Now, what will change his state or relation to God? Let us suppose a little boy is dressed clean in the morning and sent out to play. He goes to making mud pies, and in an hour his mother looks and sees him—he is a sight! She says: "Just look at that child! Come here, Johnny, and mamma will wash you and put on clean clothes." And this process is repeated every hour in the day, and when evening comes there is a great pile of soiled linen, and the boy comes up at last as dirty as at any previous call. No sensible mother would act thus. She would say: "When the boy gets tired of mud pies [change of heart], and leaves them [repentance], I'll wash him [baptism] and put on clean clothes [changed state]."

3. *The change of state* is brought about by baptism. This does not change the heart or life, for that is done by faith or repentance before you get to baptism. In fact, you can not get to baptism until you have believed with all the heart that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and have so confessed Him before men, and duly repented. It is not a mere physical act, but an act of faith and of the deepest spiritual significance; the only act authorized, in the Bible, to be done in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Baptism bears the same relation to the Kingdom of God that naturalization does to citizenship, that the ceremony of marriage does to the marital state, and that initiation does to lodge membership. Baptism to a proper candidate is for, or unto, the remission of his sins. Christ told the apostle Peter that he would give to him the keys of the Kingdom, and whatever he should bind on earth should be bound in heaven. Now, Peter used those keys (or one of them) on the day of Pentecost, when they who heard him preach were pierced in the heart, and "said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts 2:37, 38).

"Then they that gladly received his word were baptized" (Acts 2:41).

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16).

"And when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women" (Acts 8:12).

Jesus said of his own baptism: "Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness" (Matt. 3:15). If the Son of God could not fulfill all righteousness without being baptized, do you think that you can? I would not want to try it.

"Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?" (Rom. 6:3).

"For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ" (Gal. 3:27).

"Except a man be born of the water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John 3:5).

"Baptism doth also now save us" (1 Pet. 3:21).

Albert Barnes (Presbyterian) says: "No man can prove from the Bible that baptism has no important connection with salvation."

Chas. H. Spurgeon once said: "The Scripture saith, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved;' therefore he that believeth and is baptized *is saved*—the Lord's word must be true. Why do you hope about it? Believe it and enjoy it. God has said it; I believe it. Glory be to His name; He shall have all the praise."

After one has believed, repented and been baptized, he must give all diligence, and add to his faith virtue (courage), knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness and charity. "For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. Wherefore, the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall: for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" (2 Pet. 1:5-11).

When Shall We Prepare to Meet God?

The Lord says: "Now [to-day] is the day of salvation." It is always represented as too important to delay. No one has any lease on life. We may be called into His presence any moment, and we should not try to live a single day unprepared.

There is a Latin motto which says: "*He who gives early gives double.*" So that person who prepares earliest, saves his life (in service) as well as his soul (eternally). Lord Lyndhurst, who was unconverted until he was eighty years old, because he had never previously examined into the claims

of the gospel, would often exclaim: "My soul is saved, but my life has been lost!"

The temptations and inducements to postpone and delay preparation are very strong, and great is the loss to the church and to individuals from this cause.

There is an allegory which runs like this: "There was once a great revival going on upon the earth, and all hell was disturbed because of it. Satan called a council to determine what should be done to stop it. One of his imps proposed to go to the earth and tell the people that there was no God and no devil, no hell and no heaven—that death ended all, and there was no hereafter. The devil replied: 'None but fools would believe that, and they are not all fools.'

"A second imp said: 'Send me and I'll stop that revival; I'll tell them there is a God and a heaven, but no hell and no devil; that all are going to heaven by and by, and preparation is unnecessary.'

"Satan said: 'Some might try to believe such nonsense, but they would know better.'

"A third one said: 'Send me and I'll stop it.'

" 'What would you do?' asked Satan.

"The imp replied: 'I'd tell them the truth; that there is a God and a devil, a hell and a heaven, and that they must prepare for heaven or hell during life. But I'll tell them there's plenty of time; don't be in a hurry, consider carefully, don't

be hasty, wait for a more convenient season.' Satan said: 'Go! that will stop it.' "

Friends, I am sure there are *ten thousand* people who go to perdition through *procrastination* to every one who goes there from deliberate choice.

In one of my meetings a young man stood anxious and tearful, one night, during the invitation. When the audience was dismissed he came and told me that he came near coming forward, but that he was an awful sinner. I assured him that Christ was able to save unto the uttermost all that would come unto God by Him. I urged him to an immediate surrender. He was present the next night, and appeared much interested and affected. I shall never forget as he stood in the aisle and looked at me with tears in his eyes, and I gave the exhortation, "Come to-night; this may be your last chance of salvation, for the *last* opportunity comes to every lost soul that ever has any opportunity, and this may be the last time that God will ever permit you to reject his Son." But procrastination had woven its spell around him, and he did not come. *The next morning he was killed instantly in a railroad wreck, all unprepared to meet his God!*

"To-day the Saviour calls;
Ye wanderers, come.
O, ye benighted souls,
Why longer roam?

"To-day the Saviour calls;
For refuge fly:
The storm of vengeance falls,
And death is nigh.

"The Spirit calls to-day:
Yield to His power!
O, grieve Him not away;
'Tis mercy's hour."

V

WHAT CHURCH SHALL I JOIN?

A HARD QUESTION ANSWERED.

TEXT.—"And the Lord added to the church daily such as were being saved."—Acts 2: 47.

"WHAT church shall I join?" is a question which comes to almost every person, and calls for an answer. Some people answer it with ease, others with difficulty, and some give up in despair. I once asked Sam Jones why he did not tell the people certain things taught in the Bible. His answer was: "They will not let me tell them." He had learned that the willing ear was necessary to a receptive heart. Friend, will you let me help you answer the question, "What church shall I join?"? Your soul's salvation depends upon the answer to this question. Before proceeding further, I will ask you to turn to your Bible and read Acts 2: 37-47. We often hear the statement made that "one church is as good as another," but this is not true, and to affirm it is to make God the author of confusion. The church to which the Lord added those that were being saved is the

right one, and if we can find that church we shall then know what church to join. After Peter had answered the question, "But whom say ye that I am?" by saying, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," Jesus said: "Upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (Matt. 16:13-19). That church was established by the Lord through His apostles, and He added the saved to it day by day, just as fast as they were saved.

If we can ascertain how they were saved, and get ourselves saved in the same way, the Lord himself will add us to His church. If men had not sought to substitute some other way of salvation, there would not have been any confusion. This departure from the Lord's way grew into the great apostasy, and culminated in the Papacy, or Roman Catholic hierarchy. To overcome this and get back to the Lord's way, various Reformations were inaugurated. The first was by Martin Luther, who undertook to *reform* the Catholic Church, but he did not attempt to *restore* the church of Christ as it was given to the world by the apostles.

Then came John Wesley, who tried to *reform* the Episcopal Church, but he did not attempt to *restore* the church as it was in the beginning.

Luther, Calvin, Knox, Wesley, and scores of others, all attempted to reform existing conditions and correct abuses by substituting something else,

and overthrowing such abuses and errors as they perceived to exist.

Then came the Reformation of the nineteenth century, in an effort to *restore* the primitive church in its faith, ordinances and life—a reformation more definite, sweeping and thorough than any of the others which had preceded it This reformation does not repudiate anything which had been gained by former reformations. Luther and Calvin and Wesley all belong to us, and we bless God for what they did, but theirs was not a finished work. John Wesley himself says: "Brethren, I am distressed. I know not what to do. I see what I might have done once. I might have said peremptorily and expressly, 'Here I am; I and my Bible. I will not, I dare not, vary from this book, either in great things or small. I have no power to dispense with one jot or tittle of what is contained therein. I am determined to be a Bible Christian, not almost, but altogether. Who will meet me on this ground? Join me on this or not at all" ("Wesley's Sermons," Vol. II., p. 439).

You can see from the above that John Wesley saw the place and necessity for a more thorough work than his, and lamented that he had not seen it soon enough to plant himself firmly on the Bible, and the Bible only.

This is exactly the work which Alexander Campbell and his co-reformers inaugurated at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Mr. Campbell

did not start a new church; he merely exhumed, from the theological rubbish of centuries, the *lost church,* and *restored* it to the world. It was like finding a long-lost recipe. When found, and the same ingredients are used in the same manner, we shall have the same results.

There was a certain process through which sinners were taken in apostolic times, which saved them, and the Lord then added them to the church day by day. If we put sinners through that same process to-day, shall we not have the same result? Most assuredly And having secured salvation (pardon) in that way, the Lord will add you to His church. Isn't that clear?

The primitive church had certain characteristics, and the primitive church, *restored,* must possess those same characteristics, or it will not be a restoration at all.

The Name.

The name of the primitive church was "the church of God" (Acts 20:28; 1 Cor. 1:2); "the churches of God" (1 Thess. 2:14); "the churches of Christ" (Rom. 16:16); "the church" in such and such a city, as "the church in Smyrna," "the church in Pergamos," "the church in Sardis," etc.; "the church of the firstborn" (Heb. 12:23). It is also called "the kingdom of heaven" in many places. It is called "the body of Christ" (1 Cor. 12:27); "the church which is his body" (Eph. 1:22, 23); "the household of God" (Eph. 2:19).

As individuals, the members of the church were called "disciples," "saints," "brethren," "disciples of Christ," "Christians," etc. The church is also called "the bride," and Christ "the bridegroom" (Matt. 25:1; John 3:29). The bride should always wear the bridegroom's name. No faithful wife would consent to wear the name of any other man than that of her own husband, and she would dishonor him if she did. And the church just as certainly dishonors Christ by wearing other names than His.

No man's name should be placed where the name of Christ alone belongs. The expressions "church of Christ," "Christ's church" and "Christian church" are practical equivalents in the English language, just as "culture of Boston," "Boston's culture" and "Bostonian culture" all mean precisely the same thing. Is it not Christ's body?

We can never have Christian union until we drop all unscriptural names, and adopt the common family name "Christian." If we wish to add the fractions 1/2, 1/3, 1/4, 1/6 and 1/12, we must first reduce them to a common denominator (or name, for that is what the word "denominator" means). The common denominator for these common fractions is 12. 1/2=6/12, 1/3=4/12, 1/4=3/12, 1/6 =2/12, 1/12=1/12. Now we can readily add them. You notice the 1/12 did not need any change at all; it was ready to be added just as it stood. It

is precisely thus with those who already have the Scriptural names, but all others must be reduced to it.

Creed.

The word "creed" is from the Latin word *credo*, and means "I believe." The primitive church had Christ for its creed. They believed *in Him* as the Son of God, and that faith was produced by preaching the gospel. The teachings and writings of the apostles, and other sacred writings, guided them in all matters of conduct and discipline. Paul says: "All scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works" (2 Tim. 3: 16, 17). Thus a human creed is shown to be a presumption, and wholly unnecessary.

The Confession.

This is called "the good confession," and was the confession with the mouth that "Jesus Christ is the Son of God." It did not consist in a series of articles, written out by men, to which one must give his consent, or profess to believe and accept. Geo. P. Fisher, Professor of Church History in Yale College, says: "The one article of faith at the outset was that Jesus is the Messiah. Whoever acknowledged him in this character was baptized." Other church historians, such as Neander and Mosheim, say the same.

Baptism.

Those who believed, repented and confessed Christ were immediately baptized for the remission of their sins. Bear in mind that baptism was always preceded by faith, repentance, and the confession. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16).

"Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins" (Acts 2:38).

"For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ" (Gal. 3:27—R. V.).

"Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Jesus were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death" (Rom. 6:3, 4—R. V.).

"Wherein few, that is eight souls, were saved through water, which also after a true likeness doth also now save you, even baptism" (1 Pet. 3:21—R. V.).

"Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John 3:5).

Albert Barnes (Presbyterian) says: "By water here is evidently signified baptism." (Note on John 3:5.)

Timothy Dwight, president of Yale, "the greatest rabbi of the Presbyterian Church," says: "To be born again is precisely the same thing

as to be born of the water and of the Spirit; and to be born of water is to be baptized; and he who understands the nature and authority of this institution, and refuses to be baptized, will never enter into the visible nor invisible kingdom of God" ("Works," Vol. IV., 300-302).

Dr. James McKnight (Presbyterian) says: "At the beginning, He [Christ] submitted to be baptized—that is, to be buried under the water—by John, and to be raised out of it again, as an emblem of His future death and resurrection. . . . In like manner, the baptism of believers is emblematical of their own death, burial and resurrection" ("Apostolic Epistles," Vol. I., p. 263).

That this baptism was a dipping or immersion of the person in water is admitted and affirmed by all the real scholars of the world, and it was so practiced for the first thirteen hundred years of the Christian era. It is very certain that this was the practice of the primitive church, and in restoring the *primitive ordinances* of the church we must return to immersion.

The Lord's Suppper.

"And upon the first day of the week, *when the disciples came together to break bread,* Paul preached to them" (Acts 20:7).

Dr. Mason (Presbyterian) says: "The Lord's Supper was observed by the first Christians every Lord's Day, nor will this be denied by any man

who has candidly investigated the subject. . . . There is a cloud of witnesses to testify that they were kept up by succeeding Christians, with great care and tenderness, for above two centuries."

Dr. Doddridge (Congregationalist) says: "It is well known that primitive Christians administered the Eucharist every Lord's Day."

Alexander Carson (Baptist) says: "There is an admirable wisdom in the appointment of Jesus in the observance of the Lord's Supper *every first day of the week.* . . . Would it be any loss to them if all the churches of Christ were to return to this primitive practice?"

Weekly communion was the primitive, apostolic practice, and, as there is none to dispute it, we will have to return to it in order to restore the practice of the church established by Christ and His apostles, the church to which the Lord adds daily such as are being saved.

Government.

The primitive church government was congregational. Each local church attended to its own affairs, and had a plurality (or board) of elders and deacons to administer its affairs. (Elder is the same as bishop or presbyter in the New Testament.)

When you find a church which exhibits the above characteristics, you will have found the *restored* church of Christ.

The church of which I am a member does possess these marks or characteristics, and is in faith and fruit a reproduction or restoration of the "church of Christ" as established on the day of Pentecost in the city of Jerusalem. This church is *Christian, apostolic, catholic* and *holy*. Where the church of Christ differs from other religious bodies, whether Jew, Christian or pagan, I believe that it (the church of Christ) is right, and the others are in error. Having found that which is unquestionably safe and right, I have accepted it. May God help you to do likewise.

VI

CHRISTIAN UNION AND THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST

THE fittest preparation, preceding a discussion of this subject, is a careful, prayerful reading of the intercessory prayer of Jesus, found in the seventeenth chapter of John.

The *two prominent aims* of the current Reformation have been, first, the conversion of sinners, and, second, the restoration of the lost unity of the church, or Christian union; and the second is necessary in order to the accomplishment of the first. "That they may all be one; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me" (John 17:21).

Our message has been both to the world and to the churches. We say to the sinner, *"You are wrong;"* and to the members of sectarian churches, *"You are not wholly right, and your deficiencies are responsible for the unfortunate divisions amongst the professed followers of Christ."*

If union is right, division is wrong. The church was one in the beginning, and each congregation of Christians was like every other congregation in

all the essentials of faith and practice. But differences arose, which grew to such proportions as to produce divisions and alienations, based upon disagreements. And this disintegration continued until there were eight scores of warring sects, contending more against each other than for "the faith once for all delivered unto the saints." Soldiers of Christ were engaged more in civil strife than in the conquest of the world. Each man was suspicious of the soundness of his brother, and cocksure of the unsoundness of all outside the narrow limits of his own peculiar sect. And, strange as it may seem, out of this division grew an admiration of it, and doughty warriors justified it all.

With supreme desire to carry out the great commission of "discipling all the nations," and hindered and saddened by the bitterness engendered through division, just a hundred years ago (Sept. 7, 1809) Thomas Campbell wrote and promulgated the now famous "Declaration and Address," thus inaugurating the current Reformation, which in a century has grown to the enormous proportions of *eleven thousand* congregations and over twelve hundred thousand members.

That union may supplant division, and Christian sects return to oneness in Christ, we have the paradox of a *new sect* which is *unsectarian, nonsectarian* and *anti-sectarian!*

In our efforts for union we have had to attack the *causes* of division, and, although we are the

avowed champions of peace, we have appeared, to many, to be the most warlike of all Christians. But "things are not what they seem." In contending for the "one Lord," we have had to depose the Roman pontiff, and all lesser popes. In fighting for the "one faith," we have inveighed mightily against human creeds. And in our advocacy of Scriptural rites and forms, we have been forced to affirm *believers' immersion, weekly communion,* and the *congregational form of church government.* In our fighting we may not always have been as considerate of the enemy as was the Quaker who, discovering a robber in his house, said gently: "Friend, thee would better move. I am going to shoot right where thee stands." This thoughtlessness upon our part has often caused us to wound our friends, the enemy!

One of the greatest obstacles to union has been the complacent satisfaction of each sect with itself, glorying in its past achievements, and unwilling to share them with any who would not at the same time share their denominational insignia and environment, as if Luther were the exclusive inheritance of Lutherans, Calvin and Knox of Presbyterians, Wesley of Methodists, and the Campbells of the Disciples of Christ. Are not these mighty men of God the common property of Christendom? Alas that one should be of Paul and another of Cephas, and not all for Christ alone! Let us claim them all.

Whatever justifiable causes for division may have existed in the first place, these causes have for the most part, or altogether, disappeared amongst Protestants.

I do not question the fact that most noble souls, protesting against the evils of traditional systems, and longing for purer, nobler expressions of the faith than the tyranny and bigotry of those forms permitted, actually saved Christendom by destroying a unity which was maintained by authority wholly assumed. *Division* and freedom were better than *unity* and slavery. But *union* is not incompatible with liberty—the liberty which could once divide, can now unite, with sufficient incentive. Are not the incentives sufficient?

This Reformation pleads for Christian union because

First: The Bible teaches it. "There shall be one fold and one shepherd" (John 10:16).

Second: Jesus prayed for it in the seventeenth chapter of John.

Third: Paul condemned division in the church of Corinth: "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same things, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment. Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified

for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?" (1 Cor. 1:10, 12, 13).

"For ye are yet carnal: for whereas there is among you envying and strife and divisions, are ye not carnal and walk as men? For while one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not carnal? Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man? I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. So then neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase. . . . For we are laborers together with God; ye are God's husbandry, ye are God's building" (1 Cor. 3:3-7, 9).

Fourth: In order to convert the world, we must unite the church. "This Reformation proposes simply a return in letter and in spirit, in principle and in practice, to the original basis of doctrine and fellowship." Our motto has been: "Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent."

"We have no desire for a mere organic union any further or faster than a supreme love for Christ leads to unity of spirit" (*Errett*).

There is a difference between a *union* and a *mixture.* Oil and water may be mixed; they do not unite. The so-called "union meetings" are merely *mixtures,* and, like oil and water, soon return to their former consistency. If such *unions*

are good for a time, why not for *all time?* If they are *unions* at all, why do they not remain united?

The preaching of a pure gospel will produce Christians. If wheat only is put into the soil, the harvest will be wheat only. The word of God is the seed of the kingdom, and if that only is sown in the heart, we shall have Christians only.

We must have a basis of union. That basis must *omit no essential thing,* and it must *contain no non-essential thing.* If an *essential* is *omitted,* it will not be Christian, and if a *non-essential* is *included,* it will *prevent union.*

The united church must be non-sectarian. Christ alone must be the Head. The head rules the body. If all sects were to unite with, or be swallowed up by, one great sect, that would be sectarian union instead of Christian union; unless it be conceded that that particular sect was the true bride of Christ, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing. The Disciples of Christ are often accused of trying to bring about Christian union after the similitude of "the lion and the lamb," but this is a sore misapprehension. We only ask people to come to us as far as we now occupy the only tenable ground of union, and, in the language of Alexander Campbell, "we take the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, as the foundation of all Christian union and communion. Those who do not like this will please show us a more excellent way."

I recently made the statement, before the Southern California Christian Ministers' Association in Los Angeles, that I was willing to sell all our church property and devote the proceeds to missionary and charitable enterprises, and join the Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, etc., if they will simply call their churches "churches of Christ," or "Christian churches"; practice the immersion of penitent believers only, and allow each congregation to attend to its own local affairs, and spread the Lord's table every Sunday for all who want to partake of it that often. Thus we would *disappear,* to *reappear* a much-enlarged body, and with infinite might for the evangelization of the world.

The united church must have a non-sectarian creed. Christendom can never be united upon any of the creeds which have been formulated by men, and used as the rallying standards of the very divisions which union is to destroy. As long as we support human creeds there will be parties in the church. Nothing is Christian union but a union of Christians, in faith and fellowship, on the word of God—the Bible—"the creed that needs no revision;" it is the unsectarian, non-sectarian basis for the union of all Christians.

Listen to these words from John Wesley on the subject of Christian union. He says: "Brethren, I am distressed. I know not what to do. I see what I might have done once. I might have

said peremptorily and expressly, 'Here I am: I and my Bible. I will not, I dare not, vary from this book, either in great things or small. I have no power to dispense with one jot or tittle of what is contained therein. I am determined to be a Bible Christian, not almost, but altogether. Who will meet me on this ground? Join me on this or not at all' " ("Wesley's Sermons," Vol. II., p. 439).

If John Wesley had only had this vision, and felt this way a few years sooner, *he,* and not the Campbells, would have been the founder of the movement for the restoration of primitive, apostolic, Bible Christianity, and I would that it had been so.

THE UNION CHURCH MUST HAVE A BIBLE NAME.

The *seventeen* kinds of Methodists might unite on the name "Methodist."

The *thirteen* kinds of Baptists might unite on the name "Baptist."

The *twenty-two* kinds of Lutherans might unite on the name "Lutheran."

The *twelve* kinds of Presbyterians might unite on the name "Presbyterian."

BUT where and what is the name for all of these, and scores of others, when all are united in one great church or body?

Albert Barnes asks: "Should not, and will not, all these divisions yet be merged into the high and holy name 'Christian'?"

Henry Ward Beecher says: "Let me speak the language of heaven, and call you simply Christians."

A. J. Gordon says: "It was not by accident and as a term of derision that the first believers received their name; but the disciples were divinely called Christians first at Antioch (Acts 11:26). This was the name preordained for them, that 'honorable name by which ye are called.'" His name is above every other.

We must join each other on common grounds, in love of Christ, and that will be Christian union. We shall then be Christians, neither more nor less, Christians individually and collectively. Christians *plus* nothing, *minus* nothing, *divided* by nothing. Clothed with all that is Christian, and stripped of all that is unchristian.

In the language of Isaac Errett: "We call upon all the people of God in the various sects to come out from them, and unite in the faith and practice taught in the New Testament. Upon this book we must all unite.

Hold on to all that is good and Scriptural for which you now stand, yielding only the unscriptural and non-essential things, which things now divide us, and heartily accept any and all the Scriptural things which you may not have already accepted, and we may then serve God in the *one body, one Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all,* who is

above all, and through all, and in all'' (Eph. 4: 4-6). These are the seven (perfect) articles of faith.

''One Faith, one Hope, One Joy, one Strife,
One Head, one Truth, one Way, one Life;
One kingdom's universal reign,
One vast eternity sublime;
One hell to shun, one heaven to gain,
And only one probation time.''

VII

THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST

(As Preached in Duquesne Garden, Pittsburgh, at the Centennial Convention, Sunday Night, Oct. 17, 1909.)

TEXT.—"What think ye of Christ? whose son is he?" —Matt. 22: 42. (Read the first chapter of Luke.)

BRETHREN! This is the greatest question that Heaven has ever propounded to the children of men, and the answer to it is the most important that will ever come from the human heart. Answer it you *must,* and answer it you *will!* That I may help you to answer it correctly is the object of this discourse. Peter said: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Can you answer it from your heart in the same way? "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness; with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."

I first call your attention to *the ground of His presumable divinity.* Christ was not a natural product of His day and generation. If He were only a *natural* man, a *natural* generation, why were there no others like Him, at that time, before, or since then? Why not you, or I, His equal or

superior? We have had congenital, educational and social advantages which He never had, and yet He stands "the supreme man of the ages."

Men like Galileo, Kepler, Milton, Bacon, Newton and Renan set the name of Jesus above every other. George John Romanes says: "If we estimate the greatness of a man by the influence which he has exerted on mankind, there can be no question, even from the secular point of view, that Christ is much the greatest man who has ever lived" ("Thoughts on Religion," p. 169).

Jean Paul Richter says: "The life of Christ concerns Him who, being the holiest among the mighty, and the mightiest among the holy, lifted with his pierced hands empires off their hinges, turned the stream of centuries out of its channel, and still governs the ages."

Is such greatness natural to man?

Our own A. C. Smither, upon his return from Egypt and Palestine, said at the Long Beach Convention, in 1907: "First of all, I was impressed with the absolute impossibility of accounting for the person, character and service of Jesus Christ by any other than divine power. It is a moral impossibility that Palestine should have produced this Saviour of men by any mere natural or human agency."

If, therefore, He was not a natural product, or generation, He must have been a *supernatural* or *divine* personage—as presumed.

Our second step is a consideration of the *biological question involved.* For fifteen years I was a teacher in public schools, normal schools, colleges and universities of this country. In 1899 I entered Barnes University Medical College in St. Louis. My diploma bears date of 1905. I have kept fairly informed of all the developments and discoveries in biological science within the last forty years. Hence I am not on unfamiliar ground.

But you can best understand the difficulty here presented, by a concrete example or illustration, pointing to the conversion and baptism of an infidel doctor, in one of my meetings some years ago. This man had been superintendent of the schools in the city, had studied medicine, and after graduation had established a practice in this capital city. His father, who was a minister, had been a Governor of the State. This doctor had been a church-member, but had lost his faith while acquiring his medical education in the East. But few people knew of his skepticism, amongst whom was the man at whose house I was entertained, a professor in the University of that State. Through this man's invitation the doctor came one night to hear me preach. The next morning he called to see me; said he wanted help, if I could give it to him; wanted the interview kept strictly "*sub rosa,*" for the present at least. Then said he: "I am an infidel! It is not known to more than three or four persons. My own family do not know it. I

am not proud of my unbelief." I asked: "What is your trouble, and wherein are you skeptical?" He answered: "I do not believe in the *immaculate conception.*" I replied: "Neither do I. I never did believe it. I do not preach it. I never ask anybody to believe it." He replied: "What do you mean?" I said: "Exactly what I have said. I do not believe in that doctrine, which is simply a *dogma* of the Roman Catholic Church, proposed first in 1439, but adopted and made infallible in 1854. That doctrine teaches that God preserved Mary from 'original sin,' and has reference directly to Mary and not to Jesus. But I suspect you have used the wrong word, and mean that you do not believe in the Bible teaching of the *miraculous conception,* which is, that Jesus was begotten of God and not by a human father." "I see," said the doctor, "that I have used the wrong word; I thought they had the same meaning; that is my trouble, I can not believe in the virgin birth." "Then," said I, "you are indeed an unbeliever, and in a state of condemnation. Matthew and Luke both record the virgin birth, and John confirms it ninety times."

I shall give in *substance* the remainder of the interview, using as few technical, scientific terms as possible, that all may understand the argument. "You say you can not believe that God was the Father of Jesus and Mary His mother. Let me show you that you already believe *twice* as much

concerning Adam as you are asked to believe concerning Jesus Christ. Science teaches that this world was once in such a highly heated condition that there was no life upon it, just dead matter. Science also teaches that life can not come from dead matter, but that life only comes from antecedent life. That is the doctrine of *Biogenesis.* Life is here now. Where did it come from? If it could not come *from* the dead matter of the earth, it must have come *to* it, from without. Now, we call that source without, from which it came, GOD. You can call it whatever you like, but we say, 'In the beginning GOD.' The first man on this earth (or the first living thing upon this earth, from which man descended) did not have an earthly progenitor, or father, else he, or it, would not have been the first. That first man was not *generated,* but *created,* by the power without, which we call God. Now, this first man we call Adam (red earth); you may call him whatever you like, but that name suits me. God was *potentially* both *father* and *mother* to Adam. It takes the *potentiality* of father and mother, male and female, to produce such a being. God was also both father and mother, *potentially,* to the first woman, Eve; she, also, was created. God then planted those potentialities within the creatures themselves by which the race might be perpetuated by *pro*creation instead of by repeated creations." That's both reasonable and scientific.

I then said: "You believe that God was thus potentially both father and mother to Adam and Eve, but you can not believe that He was the Father only of Christ, who is the second Adam, and that the female potentiality was used just where God had planted it, and that He was brought forth of a virgin. It must be a case of *will not believe,* for you already believe *twice as much* of the supernatural regarding Adam as you are asked to believe concerning Jesus Christ." The doctor then said: "I have enough to think about now for awhile; I will see you again."

Other interviews followed, when one day he said to me: "What hinders me to be baptized?" My answer was: "If thou believest, thou mayest." He replied: "I believe that Jesus is the Son of God." Then, in the presence of his most intimate friends, I led him into the water, where he made that same confession, and then I baptized him.

(Certain immaterial changes have been made in this narrative to save any embarrassment that might grow out of such a detailed account of an actual occurrence.)

Darwin says: "Science demands a miracle to give us the unit or units lying at the beginning of the series of evolution."

The great Virchow said: "All really scientific experience tells us that life can be produced from a living antecedent only" ("The Unseen Universe," p. 229, sixth edition).

Even Huxley says: "There is not a shadow of trustworthy, direct evidence that abiogenesis (spontaneous generation) does take place, or ever has taken place, within the period during which the existence of life on the globe is recorded" ("Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol. III., p. 689, article "Biology").

Prof. Alfred Russel Wallace (in 1910) said: "There was at some stage in the history of the earth, after the cooling process, a definite act of creation. Something came from the outside. In a word, life was given to the earth. Materialism is dead for all intelligent minds."

There is a corollary growing out of the above which furnishes scientific proof of immortality. It is this, *that if the life that is now here came from without, it can go beyond again, and continue to exist.*

There are some who claim that they can not believe in the inspiration of the Bible, and hence they question the reliability of the records therein given. I can not here discuss the canonicity and authenticity of the Holy Scriptures, but a quotation or two bearing on this subject may not be amiss. Rousseau says: "Can it be that writings so sublime and simple are the work of man? Can He whose life they tell be Himself no more than a mere man? My friend, men do not invent like this, and the facts respecting Socrates, which no one doubts, are not so well attested as those about

Jesus Christ. These Jews could never have struck this tone, or thought of this morality. And the gospel has characteristics of truthfulness, so grand, so striking, so perfectly inimitable, that their inventors would be even more wonderful than He whom they portray."

John Stuart Mill says: "That were a greater miracle than Christ himself."

Theodore Parker says: "Suppose we say that Plato, Newton and Shakespeare never lived. Then, who did their wonders and thought their thoughts? It would take a Shakespeare to *forge* a Shakespeare; it would take a Newton to *fabricate* a Newton; and it would take a Jesus to *invent* a Jesus. To say that the disciples invented Jesus is like the man who declared that Homer did not write the 'Iliad.' He said: 'It was written by another man by that name, who lived about the same time' "!

Whence but from heaven
Could men, unskilled in arts,
In several ages born,
In several parts,
Weave such agreeing truths?
Or how, or why,
Should all conspire
To cheat us with a lie?
Unasked their pains,
Ungrateful their advice,
Starving their gains,
And martyrdom their price.

—*Dryden.*

If the Scriptures are not what they purport to be, then they are forgeries and impositions, given to us through a period of nearly two thousand years, and coming from some forty different men and women, reaching from Moses to St. John the Revelator, the disciple most loved. Were these authors capable of such forgeries?

In further attestation of Christ's divinity we come now to consider His resurrection from the dead. Paul says (Rom. 1:4): "And declared to be the *Son of God,* with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, *by the resurrection from the dead.*" It all amounts to nothing, yea, worse than nothing, if He did not rise from the dead. "And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain and your faith is also vain: ye are yet in your sins. . . . If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable" (1 Cor. 15:14-28).

The priests and Pharisees went to Pilate the next morning after Jesus was put in the tomb and said: "Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again. Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: so the last error shall be worse than the first." Pilate said unto them: "Ye have a watch; go your way, make it as sure as you can. So they went,

and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone and setting a watch'' (Matt. 27:63-66).

The Roman watch consisted of from forty to sixty armed soldiers. But the body disappeared. What became of it? If it was stolen away, as a dead body, it was done by either *friend* or *foe.* But His friends *could not* get it, and His enemies *would not* take it. The Roman law attached five death penalties to the stealing of that body, or meddling with that tomb. It was *death* to break that seal; it was *death* to allow it to be broken; it was *death* to steal the body; it was *death* to allow any one to steal it; it was *death* to be asleep when on guard. And yet the body disappeared, and no one was ever punished for any violation of the law. How do you account for that?

Testimony of Enemies.—The soldiers said Christ's disciples came and stole Him away while they slept. Let us examine that testimony. If they were asleep, how did they know what took place? Most of us find it difficult to tell what takes place when we are awake, but these fellows can tell just what was done, and who did it, when they were asleep! Besides, to admit they were asleep would have meant death to them. Do you believe that forty or more men would all be asleep at one time, when the penalty was death? No, they were not asleep. They lied, and the law did not crucify men for lying, but paid them big money for it!

Testimony of Friends.—Peter says: "Him God raised up the third day, and showed him openly, not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him *after he rose from the dead*" (Acts 10: 40, 41). A competent witness of His resurrection would be one who knew Him when alive, saw Him when dead and saw Him alive again. Peter was such a person.

The following also bear competent testimony: Mary Magdalene; the two disciples who walked with Him to Emmaus; the women from Galilee; the ten apostles in the upper room; the eleven, with Thomas present, in the same room a week later; the seven apostles at Tiberias; then five hundred brethren at one time. James the Less saw Him (1 Cor. 15). The eleven saw Him on ascension day. Stephen saw Him at his martyrdom. Paul saw Him on his way to Damascus. And John saw Him again, on the isle of Patmos, in the year 96, when he received the last book of the New Testament. He was seen at least eleven times by over six hundred people.

Lyman Abbott says: "Christ's resurrection is the best attested fact in history."

It may be hard to believe in the resurrection of Christ, but I can not disbelieve it and account for the attendant facts in any satisfactory way. "If weak thy faith, why choose the harder side?" *I believe it.* It is a matter of faith, not of knowl-

edge. "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed" (John 20:29). I claim that blessing.

Paul says: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and *believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead,* thou shalt be saved" (Rom. 10:9). I stand there.

My last argument is that *the fruits of Christianity attest His divinity.* "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God" (John 7:17). "By their fruits ye shall know them" (Matt. 7:16).

Romanes says: "It is on all sides worth considering that the revolution effected by Christianity in human life is immeasurable and unparalleled in any other movement in history."

Alexander Campbell says: "If Christ is not divine, then a lie has done more to civilize the world than all the truth that ever existed."

Chas. Darwin ("Journal of Research," pp. 486 and 468) says: "Upon leaving New Zealand, I look back upon *but one bright spot,* and that is Waimate, with its Christian inhabitants." Of those who criticized the missionaries of the South Sea Islands, he wrote: "Should he chance to be at the point of shipwreck on some unknown coast, he will most devoutly pray that the lesson of the missionary may have extended thus far."

In 1849 and 1850 was the great rush to the gold fields of California. The same year the first

missionaries were sent to the Fiji Islands, where a human being could be bought for the market price of seven dollars, killed and eaten without protest. In 1900, just fifty years later, you could not have bought a human being for all the gold that had been mined in California from 1850 to 1900. There are over twelve hundred Christian chapels there now, and nine-tenths of the population go to church every Sunday, and human life is as secure as it is in any city in America. Yes, Christianity revolutionizes human character. You are not afraid to trust your life, property or honor in the hands of a true follower of Jesus Christ.

H. L. Hastings tells of a Christian banker and his infidel nephew, traveling on horseback over Kansas or Nebraska, and coming one night to a lonely trapper's dugout for shelter and rest; only he and his old wife lived there. The surroundings looked suspicious, and the travelers decided that one should watch while the other slept. The uncle retired first; the nephew sat up to watch. After an hour or so, the older man was awakened by the younger one trying to slip into bed. The old man awoke, and asked if it were time for him to get up and watch. "No, just lie still; it is not late, but I am coming to bed too." "Well, then, I'll get up." "No, Uncle, just lie still; we are perfectly safe; you need not be afraid." "How do you know we are safe?" "Well, that old man got his Bible and read a chapter, and they got

down and prayed, before they went to bed. I heard that prayer, and I'm not afraid. He prayed for us, for you and for me, and for our families, and that's more than I've done myself. I'm not afraid to stay here now." "Neither am I," said the uncle, and they both went to sleep, feeling secure. If that old trapper had read a portion of Tom Paine's "Age of Reason," and he and his wife had played cards for a couple of hours before retiring (like some of you do), they would have been watched all night!

A ship was wrecked somewhere in the South Seas. Those who reached the shore hid themselves and looked longingly for a friendly sail. The hours dragged wearily on. Hunger, thirst and wounds necessitated more than "watchful waiting." One of the men, a brave young sailor, volunteered to scale the cliffs, and see what lay beyond; for any moment a band of cannibals might discover the wreck, trace them to their hiding-place, capture, kill and devour them. The young man climbed slowly, painfully, laboriously to the top, and, raising himself cautiously, looked beyond, then turned and beckoned, and called: "Come on, come on; we are saved; we are saved!" What did he see? A church spire! The missionary of the cross had been there. They made their way to the village, were kindly received and tenderly cared for, and sent back to San Francisco. The captain, a wicked old sailor, hardened and godless,

had little to say until he got home, then he went to church, and lost no time in surrendering his heart and life to Jesus Christ. He said: "I know He is the Saviour; *He saved me*—saved my life, my body, and I know He can save my soul; and He shall have the life that He has already saved!" Jesus has already saved us a thousand times, and in a thousand ways, and He alone can save us *in eternity*. He is the Son of God, the Saviour of the world.

VIII

WHAT IS RELIGION?

" 'Tis religion that can give
Sweetest pleasures while we live.
'Tis religion must supply
Solid comfort when we die."

(From an old hymn.)

"But in vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men. Ye leave the commandment of God, and hold fast the tradition of men. And he said unto them, Full well do ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your tradition."—Mark 7: 7-9.

THIS text is a fearful arraignment of those who follow men instead of Christ.

Paul is equally severe in Col. 2:18-23, where he warns us against the ordinances, commandments and doctrines of men, and tells us *not* to *touch, taste* nor *handle* them, for, if we do, we shall perish with their using.

A *precept* is a prescribed rule of action or conduct. Many are the rules that men have laid down and prescribed and substituted for those of the Lord. In this I do not allude to those expediencies in the work or worship of God which He has left

entirely to our judgment, convenience and wisdom to devise—such as church houses, pews, pulpits, printed Bibles, blackboards, charts, hymn-books, musical instruments, baptisteries, stoves, furnaces, committees, societies for doing charity and missionary work, church papers, Bible schools and Bible colleges. All these are merely expediencies for doing the very things which God has commanded us to do, and must not be confounded with those *precepts, commandments* and *doctrines* of men, the teaching and practice of which constitute a vain worship of God.

The word "religion" occurs but five times in the Bible, and the word "religious" but twice; viz., Acts 13:43; 26:5; Gal. 1:13, 14; Jas. 1:26, 27.

Such terms as "getting religion" and "losing religion" are unscriptural and misleading, and should not be used. Any kind of worship or faith is called "religion," as the Jew's religion, Mohammedan religion, pagan religion, etc. Religion, therefore, is a form of faith or worship, and Christianity is the faith or worship of the God of the Bible through Jesus Christ, who is believed by us to be the Son of God and the only Saviour of the world.

This religion is both *objective* and *subjective. Objectively,* it is the system of truth and worship revealed by Christ and His apostles, and recorded in the New Testament, by and through which man

is saved and brought back to God, from whom he has become alienated by sin and disobedience. "It is what God does for us." Religion seems to be derived from the prefix *re,* which means *again,* and *ligio, to bind.* It therefore means to bind anew; to bind again; to bind fast. *Subjectively,* it is piety, holiness, godliness—our religious experience. "It is what we do for ourselves."

We are concerned in this discourse with the *subjective* phase of religion. Religion, subjectively, consists of three things; viz., (1) Our thoughts toward God; (2) our actions toward God; (3) our feelings toward God. It *can not* be more than this, and it *must not* be less.

Thoughts are the result of our knowledge. Feelings are the result of our thoughts. Actions are the result of our feelings. Thought: "What think ye of Christ? whose Son is he?" Feeling: Do you love Him or not? Action: Are you obedient or disobedient?

Many people have been led to think that a certain peculiar, happy, joyous, pleasurable feeling is itself religion—and they call it "heartfelt religion." I believe in sincere, heartfelt religion, but that is more than mere good feeling.

The getting of this feeling of pleasurable excitement under religious stimulation is called conversion, or "getting religion," and it is believed to have been produced by the action of the Holy Ghost in a mysterious and supernatural way. The

relief which they experience is attributed to the removal of their sins, and that is evidence, to them, of the pardon of all their transgressions. They constantly and confidently appeal to their feeling as evidence of their acceptance with God, whereas our acceptance with God depends upon *His* feeling about it instead of ours.

They believe they are saved because they *feel good,* when they should feel good because they *know* they are saved, by having God's word for it. God can not lie, whereas our feelings are very deceptive and unreliable.

Ask yourself these questions: Do I do right because I feel good, or do I feel good because I do right? Do I serve the Lord because I am happy, or am I happy because I serve the Lord? Do you know you are pardoned because you feel good, or do you feel good because you know you are pardoned?

I have known bad people to feel good, and I have known some good people who did not feel good, and were not happy.

I have seen a drunken man who was feeling good, acting like he owned the whole town, and was trying to walk on both sides of the street at the same time. He had no right to feel good, you must admit, hence his "good feeling" was no evidence that he was doing right.

I have seen good people who were in great distress and were feeling bad, but that was no

evidence that they were bad people, and were wicked in the sight of God.

We should never feel better nor worse than our actions will justify, and the correctness of our actions must be determined by God's word and not by our feelings.

Paul *felt* that he was doing right when he was destroying the church of God, and he says he was the "chief of sinners," yet he felt all right!

This whole system is wrong, for it aims to "reconcile God to the sinner," instead of "reconcile the sinner to God." The "anxious-seat" sinner virtually says: "Here I am, Lord; come and save me; give me that good feeling, so I'll know I am pardoned; O Lord, come, do come, Lord! and if the Lord will only be pleased to come and pardon me, then I'll join the church and be good."

Don't you see the work and effort are all with God? Does God need to be converted to the sinner, or does the sinner need to be converted to God? John R. Graves, a noted Baptist preacher and editor of the South, says: "Sinners have almost come to believe that they can not get religion without the revival and mourners' bench, or altar of prayer, with the loud and confused prayers and singing and shouting all together that usually accompany the bench, the altar or the straw-pen.

"Multitudes are tremendously excited and made to profess a change of feeling, and in this state

hurried into the church; but the vast majority of these cases, when they cool off, find themselves back just where they were before the excitement and profession. And after going through this process once or twice more, they become thoroughly disgusted with what had been palmed off on them as religion, and are prepared to become obstinate infidels. We are satisfied that nine-tenths of all the infidels and Universalists of this country have become so through the influence of those benches, altars and straw-pens." (See *Briney's Monthly*, November, 1901.)

That is very strong language from a man who had ample opportunity to know whereof he affirmed.

To further show the incompetency of feeling and the unreliableness of it as a witness to the truth, note this: One man *proves* his justification, or pardon, by feeling; another *proves* his sanctification (second blessing) by *his* feeling; another *proves* his glorification (third blessing) by *his* feeling; another *proves* his deification (fourth blessing) by *his* feeling; a Roman Catholic, just from the confessional, *proves* that the priest pardoned his sins, by *his* feeling; the Mohammedan also *proves* his sins are pardoned by *his* feeling. How can you grant the witness to be true and reliable in one instance and not reliable in the others?

Ah! friends, feeling is not the witness at all. *Truth* is our only safe guide, and "*thy word is*

truth''! Why, you can not tell north from south by your feelings. Who has not been turned around that he could not tell which way was north? and yet you *felt* that a certain direction was north, in spite of the fact that the compass pointed in the opposite direction. Even Paul says: "I verily thought with myself, that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth" (Acts 26:9).

Feelings may be right or they may be wrong, but God's word is right and can't be wrong.

If I were lost in the woods with two men, and one had a compass, while the other was guided by his feelings, and these two differed, I would certainly follow the one with the compass. Wouldn't you?

Kerr B. Tupper once said, when I was in Denver in 1892, on the subject of "Knowing You Are a Christian": "Many people put wrong tests to themselves in settling the matter. Many make feeling the standard of judgment. Nowhere in the Bible is emphasis placed on emotion. In Scripture it is always principle and truth, never feeling and emotion. . . . The only test is obedience based on intelligent faith. The true Christian is the man who yields heart and intellect to the service of God."

The emphasis given to feeling or emotion in religious revivals is the thing which led to the substitution of the "mourners' bench" in the place of baptism, for it is here that a doctrine, a precept,

a command, of man has been substituted for the command or ordinance of our Lord; viz., Christian baptism.

The "mourners' bench" was unknown in the Christian world until about one hundred years ago. It was taken up and used and popularized by Charles G. Finney in his great revival work in America some fifty or sixty years ago. No one, therefore, is better qualified to speak on this subject than Chas. G. Finney. In his "Revival Lectures" (revised), page 254, he says: "In the days of the apostles, baptism answered this purpose. The gospel was preached to the people, and then all those who were willing to be on the side of Christ were called out to be baptized. *It held the precise place that the anxious-seat does now as a public manifestation of their determination to be Christians.*" You may say, "Well, that's news to me." Very true, but the oldest things in religion are the newest to those who have been substituting the precepts of men for the commandments of God.

Geo. P. Fisher (Professor of Church History in Yale College—Congregationalist) says: "The one article of faith at the outset was that Jesus is the Messiah. Whoever acknowledged him in this character was baptized." (Not asked to go to an "anxious-seat" or into an "inquiry-room.") ("Christian Life; Christian Worship; Christian Teaching," Chap. III., p. 42.)

Neander's "Church History" (Vol. I., p. 385) says: "At the beginning, when it was important that the church should rapidly extend itself, those who confessed their belief in Jesus as the Messiah (amongst the Jews), or their belief in one God, and in Jesus as the Messiah (amongst the Gentiles), were immediately baptized, as appears from the New Testament."

Mosheim says: "Whoever acknowledged Christ as the Saviour of mankind, and made a solemn profession of his confidence in Him, was immediately baptized and received into the church" (Maclain's "Mosheim—First Century," Part II., Chap. II., Sec. 7, p. 38).

People thus converted were saved. God's way has not changed, nor is it possible for us to improve on His way, or substitute something better. I want people to be happy in the Lord and to feel good, but not too soon, or before *the truth* gives them the right to rejoice. When God says, "Now you may rejoice," then you may be sure you have something to rejoice over, and may feel good and be happy.

"He went on his way rejoicing" (Acts 8:39). Who? The eunuch. When? *After* he was baptized, not before.

"He *rejoiced,* believing in God, with all his house" (Acts 16:34). Who? The jailor and his household, at Philippi. When? *After* they were baptized, not before.

"If ye know these things, *happy* are ye if ye do them" (John 13:17).

You must surely believe in the Lord Jesus and repent most truly of your sins, and then, confessing the name of Jesus before men, "be baptized into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

"They that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." "And the Lord added to the church daily those that were being saved." "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

There's absolutely no evidence that they were added, then saved, and then baptized, or that they were saved, then added, and then baptized (or not baptized at all, just as they saw fit). But God *adds* only the saved, and God's order seems to be (1) baptized, (2) saved, (3) added that same day, or daily.

You may say that you know *by your feelings* that you were saved without, or before, baptism. I may say that I know by the word of God that I was saved when I was baptized, and I *feel* that way; now, isn't my feeling worth just as much as yours, while I have the added weight of God's word on my side? Feelings may change, but His word never changes. Only those feelings produced by His word will abide unchanged forever.

IX

THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS DISEASES

TEXT.—"For this cause many are *weak* and *sickly* among you, and *many sleep.*"—1 Cor. 11: 30.

CHRISTIANS are those persons who believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and who have accepted Him as their Lord and Saviour. They have been born anew, of the water and of the Spirit. They are new creatures, saints, peculiar people, zealous of good works; Spirit-led and Spirit-filled men and women. No one is a Christian merely because he goes to church, any more than that he is a *calf* because he drinks *milk!* Many people say they are Christians, but not saints. That's a mistake. If you are a Christian, you are a saint. Where did you learn that the word "saint" meant more than the name "Christian"? Oh, you got your idea from Rome, and not from Jerusalem. With Rome, a saint is a *dead one*—been dead several hundred years—long enough to forget all his defects, and to magnify his virtues out of all proportion to the deeds of the living. Then he is *canonized,* made a saint!

That's the Roman brand. But God's saints are Christians, and all Christians are saints. If you are not a saint while living, there is nothing in death to make one out of you. Only saints will go to heaven.

Christians are found wherever the gospel has been preached, believed and obeyed, and nowhere else. The gospel is the seed, Christians the fruit. Christians are known by their fruits—just as a tree. They are the salt of the earth, and as salt saves and preserves that with which it comes in contact, so Christians are saving those with whom they associate, and unless you do *save* them they will *spoil* you. If the salt does not save the meat, both spoil and are cast out and trodden underfoot of men.

Christians are the light of the world; some of us are very dim lights. Some are "tallow dips," and need *snuffing!* Some are under a bushel or under a bed. Some are "turned off" altogether, or are burning a "high-low," to save *current.* Some are dirty, coal-oil-lamp Christians, and need cleaning and filling with the oil (Word and Spirit) of life.

And "many are weak and sickly," and need "treatment," which treatment must be suited to the particular disease with which the patient is afflicted. An Irishman's wife was ill, and when he was asked if she were "dangerous," he answered: "Faith, no, she's too weak!" Many Christians

are *too weak* to be dangerous to the powers of darkness.

The following are some of the spiritual diseases most common in our day:

Sleeping sickness. "Many sleep." The "trypan-a-sō-ma," or "tsetse" fly, has inoculated them, and they will sleep and sleep, until they sleep the sleep of eternal death.

Others have *malaria,* or the *"bad air"* disease. Get it from keeping bad company, and living in a poisonous social atmosphere, where the *"Culex Anapholes"* of sin injects the *"plasmodium malarie"* into their circulation, and they have "chills and fever." These need the *quinine* of reproof, correction and instruction in righteousness.

"Morbus Sabbaticus" is a common complaint. "Sunday sickness." A Saturday night dose of Bible reading, and study of the Sunday-school lesson, will cure this malady.

Another disease, said to afflict women more often than men (though I think not), is *"palpitation of the mouth,"* or *"chronic verbal eruption,"* an *eczema,* or breaking out at the mouth. Luther Benson, who wrote "Fifteen Years in Hell," the most vivid description of delirium tremens ever penned by man, and which deserves to be ranked with De Quincey's classic, "The Confessions of an English Opium-eater," told of a woman in a small town in Illinois who went from house to house,

from morn till night, with tales of blistering blight, and would go to church on Sunday and sit up and sing: *"O for a thousand tongues!"* Benson exclaims: "What would the State of Illinois have done if she had had a thousand tongues like the one she had!"

Some have *dropsy.* They first take a *drop* of liquor, then in rapid succession they *drop* their money, their friends, their business, their character, their health, their hope of heaven, and then they *drop* into hell.

In the South there are many *colonels,* but in the church many *generals*—*"General Debility!"*

Hydrophobia is very often met with. *Hydra* means water, *phobia* means fear. Many are afraid of water, and when you say "water" (baptism) they "throw a fit." We have to Pasteurize them. Others have *hydrocephalus,* which means "water on the brain." With them salvation is a matter of water. It's water, water, water, holy water! Water sprinkled everywhere and on everything. Don't you put any faith in water. You believe in Jesus Christ, and use water just when and where He commands it, in baptism, and but once—which will cure hydrocephalus.

The *"she-did-its"* is the first disease described in the Bible. When God asked Adam about his conduct, he replied: *"She did it"*—"the woman whom thou gavest to be with me, *she* gave me of the tree, and I did eat." And then the Lord asked Eve,

and she caught the same disease, for she replied: *"The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat."* Yes, the devil did it! You see? We are too prone to blame others for what we should accuse ourselves. *Self-accusation is easy for other people to stand.* Try it.

Supersoundness is a sort of elephantiasis of the soul. Some people are so sound they are like a bass drum—all sound. There's no peace or quietness where they are. They suspect everybody of heresy, or unsoundness, and are like the Scotchman who said there were only two men in the world that were sound—himself and his brother Sandy; and he sometimes had his *"doots aboot Sandy."*

Another very distressing disease is *"congestion of the wallet."* The work of the church has been much retarded in all ages by this persistent disease. Some men give of their *means* liberally and enjoy it, while others give out of their *meanness* with great distress! "Heart failure" is the invariable accompaniment of this disease. Jessie Brown Pounds once said: "We have men in our church who are willing to stake their lives on the correctness of our position as to the *mode, subject* and *design* of baptism, but when it comes to the collection they are only willing to stake a nickel on it."

The last disease which I shall name is the *"never-get-over-its."* Those persons who have be-

come *mortally offended* because of *real* or *imaginary* wrongs, and who quit the church, and spend their time in its abuse, or that of its members. I was once in a great tent meeting in a county-seat town in Missouri. An old man, a regular attendant, sat well up in front every night, and seemed to rejoice in seeing many respond to the gospel invitation, but was immovable himself. After several weeks I received an invitation to take dinner with him. His son, a lawyer and judge, came to me and said: "You are to take dinner with father to-morrow, and I want to tell you about him and his trouble, and I hope you may be able to do him some good, for he has made home very miserable and unhappy ever since the war." I said: "Judge, I have heard about it, and I am going to administer heroic treatment to him." The old brother anxiously awaited my coming, and soon after my arrival introduced his grievance. I let him tell his story; of how he had been mistreated by certain men in the church, out at an old, country meeting-house, *during the war.* After he had finished, I asked him for the names of these men, that I might see if they were not willing to fix up things agreeable to him. He replied: "Why, Bro. Martin, they are all dead now." "What! All dead? And you are hating and reviling dead men? Have you nothing better to do than to hate dead men's bones? You think these men have gone to hell because you suspect that they informed the

soldiers as to where you had hidden your horses, and so you quit the church, and went back on Jesus, and all the good people in the church, none of whom ever wronged you. If you could not live with these men on earth, why are you going to hell to spend eternity with them? See here; you must forgive them or you are a lost man. Do you remember the unmerciful servant (Matt. 18: 24-35) who owed his lord ten thousand talents (or twenty million dollars) and was forgiven the debt, but who refused to forgive one of his fellow-servants who owed him one hundred pence, or seventeen dollars?" I read the passage to him, with the awful sentence: "*Deliver him to the tormentors, till he shall pay all that was due unto him. So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses.*" I then quoted Mark 11:25, 26: "And when ye stand praying, *forgive* if ye have aught against any; that your Father also which is in heaven may forgive your trespasses. But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses." Then I quoted from the Lord's Prayer: "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those that trespass against us." Just then dinner was called, and how I did enjoy that dinner, but "grandpa" had lost his appetite! When dinner was over, I soon went back to my room. That night "grandpa" was in his accustomed place. When

the invitation was given, he said: "Let me out, let me out." He reached the aisle, and started toward me, saying: *"Oh, Brother Martin, I forgive 'em, I forgive 'em! Lord Jesus, forgive me; oh, forgive me!"* There wasn't a dry eye in that great tent.

A year later I saw him, and he told me how happy he had been that year, and he soon expected to go to heaven and see those old brethren of the old country church, who were such good neighbors before the war. He is gone now, and I hope is with them all in heaven.

"The sandal-tree perfumes, when riven,
The ax that laid it low;
Let man, who hopes to be forgiven,
Forgive and bless his foe."

"He healeth all our diseases."

X

INFANT BAPTISM

TEXT.—"And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."—Eph. 6: 4.

"And they brought young children to him, *that he should touch them:* and his disciples rebuked those that brought them. But when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. *And he took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them.*"—Mark 10: 13-16.

FOR hundreds of years discussion has raged over infant baptism, and in most pedobaptist churches there is no unanimity of faith and practice. It has been a source of contention and strife from its first introduction in the second and third centuries, some affirming, and others denying, the right of infants to be baptized. We all agree, however, that the parent, the church and the state are each and all under obligations to the child, and these should work in harmony for his good.

They brought young children to Jesus that He should touch them. Right here let me say that if it is the will of God, it would then be my greatest pleasure to baptize infants. I have no prejudice one way or the other. I have nothing against the infants, and nothing against baptism. I should be only too glad to baptize infants if the Lord commanded it. But I do object to infant baptism, or any other baptism, which the Bible does not authorize. Both babies and baptism are found many times in the New Testament, but never found together. God has not joined them together. "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not." These words of Christ never had anything to do with baptism, and it is a deceitful use of His words to quote them as a text in favor of such a practice. Jesus never baptized anybody, much less these children. There is not a word about baptism in the passage. "He put his hands upon them, and blessed them;" "Jesus himself baptized not" (John 4:2).

All Protestants are supposed to adhere to the maxim of Chillingworth, which is this: *"The Bible, and the Bible only, contains the religion of Protestants."*

It is a maxim of law that *the best possible testimony is the admission of your adversary or opponent.*

Definition of "Infant Baptism."—"It is the sprinkling or pouring of water upon, or the im-

mersion of, an infant child in water, in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit." It is called "pedobaptism," from the Greek word *pais* (paid), meaning child. It is called "christening" because it was supposed to induct the child into Christ, and make a Christian of it, at which time its name was pronounced, and that name was called its Christian name; as, John Smith, *John* would be the name given at the *christening,* and hence the "Christian name."

We affirm that there is neither command nor example for infant baptism in the New Testament.

As "the best possible testimony is the admission of an opponent," I shall give the testimony of many eminent pedobaptists, as follows:

Dean Stanley (Episcopalian): "The New Testament has no example of infant baptism—a departure from primitive usage" ("Christian Institutes," pp. 20, 21).

Lange: "All attempts to make out infant baptism from the New Testament fail."

De La Rogue: "The primitive church did not baptize infants."

Dr. A. T. Bledsoe (one of the most eminent and scholarly preachers of the M. E. Church, South, in his famous article on "The History of Infant Baptism," in the *Southern Review,* of which he was the editor, Vol. XIV., No. 30, April, 1874, pp. 334, 336) says: "It is an article of our faith that the baptism of young children is in anywise

to be retained in the church, as most agreeable to the institution of Christ. But, yet, with all our searching, we have been unable to find, in the New Testament, a single express declaration, or word, in favor of infant baptism. . . . This may perhaps be deemed, by some of our readers, a strange position for a pedobaptist. It is by no means, however, a singular opinion,

"Hundreds of learned pedobaptists have come to the same conclusion; especially since the New Testament has been subjected to a closer, more conscientious and more candid exegesis than was formerly practiced by controversialists.

"But, what we wish to emphasize most particularly is the wonderful contrast between the *silence of Christ* and the everlasting clamors of His church. Though He uttered *not one express word* on the subject of infant baptism, yet on this very subject have his professed followers filled the world with sound and fury."

Dean Henry Alford (Episcopalian) says: "They ought to declare that infant baptism was a practice *unknown* to the apostles."

Henry Ward Beecher ("Christian Union," May 8, 1864): "I concede and assert, first, that infant baptism is nowhere commanded in the New Testament. No man can find a passage that commands it . . . . There is no well-attested case of its administration in the New Testament, and it is not brought down as a substitute for circumcision—

a doctrine which is utterly untenable, to say nothing more."

PROF. J. L. JACOBI, of Berlin, says: "Infant baptism was established neither by Christ nor His apostles."

NEANDER (church historian): "It is certain that Christ did not ordain infant baptism."

DR. WALL ("History of Infant Baptism"): "Among all the persons that are recorded as baptized by the apostles, there is no express mention of any infant."

DR. BLOOMFIELD: "Commands or plain examples in the New Testament, relative to it, I do not find."

SCHAFF-HERZOG CYCLOPEDIA: "There is no trace of infant baptism in the New Testament."

MEYER'S COMMENTARY ON ACTS: "Therefore the baptism of the children of Christians, of which no trace is found in the New Testament, is not to be held as an apostolic ordinance."

MARTIN LUTHER says: "It can not be proved by the sacred Scriptures that infant baptism was instituted by Christ, or began by the first Christians after the apostles" (Booth's "Pædobaptism Examined," Vol. I., p. 303, 1787—from A. R.'s "Vanity of Infant Baptism," Part II., p. 8—Abraham Booth, a noted English writer).

DOCTRINAL CATECHISM (Catholic Church—approved by Archbishop Hughes, Baltimore):

"Q. How do Catholics prove that infants ought to be baptized?

"A. Not from Scripture alone, which is not clear on this subject, but from Scripture illustrated by the constant tradition of the church. It does not appear from the Scripture that even one infant was ever baptized, therefore Protestants should reject it; on their own principle, infant baptism is an unscriptural usage."

THOMAS CHALMERS, D.D. (Presbyterian—chief founder of the Presbyterian Free Church of Scotland), says: "If the Scriptures give us no other testimony in favor of infant baptism, they give us at least *the testimony of their silence.*"

I have here quoted *fifteen* of the most competent and best known pedobaptist writers, from Martin Luther down to the present, and all declare that infant baptism is *unknown to the New Testament.* If "the Bible only" contains our religion, we shall have to *drop infant baptism forever.*

GROUNDS OF INFANT BAPTISM.

It is either a sin to baptize infants, or it is a sin to neglect it. Certainly it is not left to our choice or whim. They either *should* or *should not* be baptized.

The question arises: "On what ground has the baptism of infants been practiced?"

We answer, "On the ground of pure theological speculation."

First—*The doctrine of original sin.*

Second—*The doctrine of baptismal regeneration.*

ORIGEN (A. D. 185-254) believed in the guilt of infants, and also took the extreme view with reference to the magical power of water (holy water, or *tran-sel-lem-en-ta-ted* water), and he is the first man on record to advocate the practice of infant baptism. When he was besieged with inquiries concerning this new practice, he answered: "Having occasion given in this place, I will mention a thing that causes frequent inquiries among the brethren: Infants are baptized for the forgiveness of sins. Of what sins? or when have they sinned? or how can any reason of the laved in their case hold good?

"But, according to that sense we mentioned even now: None is free from pollution, though his life be but of the length of one ray upon the earth. And it is for that reason because of the sacrament of baptism that pollution of our birth is taken away, that infants are baptized" (Origen's "Works," Vol. I., p. 65). But we find that

TERTULLIAN, who lived at the same time, *opposed* infant baptism, because he did not believe in the doctrine of original sin, though he did believe in the holy-water dogma.

In further proof of the correctness of my answer, I will quote from Dr. Bledsoe and John Wesley.

DR. BLEDSOE says: "Thus, according to Neander, the tendency in favor of infant baptism

obtained the victory in the Western Church (Roman Catholic) by means of two things:

"1. The magical notion of baptism.

"2. The doctrine of original sin.

"Tertullian opposed the practice of infant baptism because his views of original sin were not sufficiently developed."

JOHN WESLEY ("Doctrinal Tracts," p. 251) says: "If infants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper subjects of baptism: seeing, in an ordinary way, they can not be saved unless this be washed away by baptism. In an ordinary way there is no other means of entering into the church or even into heaven."

John Wesley wrote the above as an Episcopalian; he was a High Churchman, and died an Episcopalian, March 2, 1791.

The above is not the teaching of the great Methodist Church of to-day; though they still practice infant baptism, they do so upon other grounds, which we regard as even worse than the above.

Though the original grounds of infant baptism, as given by Origen, have been pretty generally abandoned except by Catholics and High Church Episcopalians, many and diverse are the grounds upon which the practice is sought to be perpetuated.

CYPRIAN grounds it on "*the universality of divine grace.*"

AUSTIN, on "*the faith of the church.*"

BAXTER, on *"the faith of the parents."*

CHURCH OF ENGLAND, on *"the faith of the sponsors."*

LUTHER, on *"the faith of the infants themselves."*

CALVIN, on *"faith and repentance in semine."*

DR. HALLEY, on *"the commission to teach and baptize all nations."*

DR. E. WILLIAMS, on *"the moral qualifications of the infants themselves."*

DR. MILLER (Independent) says: "The children of professing Christians are already in the church. They were born members. They were baptized because they were members."

The above is also the teaching of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

BISHOP S. M. MERRILL says: "Infants are in the kingdom, and therefore they ought to be admitted to the right of baptism" (*Christian-Evangelist,* St. Louis, March 22, 1900).

THE METHODIST DISCIPLINE (p. 35, edition of 1896) says: "We hold that all children, by virtue of the unconditional benefit of the Atonement, are members of the kingdom of God, and therefore graciously entitled to baptism."

Nothing more *absolutely false* and *unscriptural* than the above has ever been put forth as an excuse for infant baptism. It is simply astonishing. Why, if that is true, there is not an alien sinner on earth, and has not been one since Jesus made the atone-

ment. Everybody has been born, and everybody is therefore *in the kingdom of God.* There's not a soul now out of Christ's kingdom, if everybody is born (of the flesh) into it. Then, all that remains is just to baptize them because they are already in the kingdom of God.

I deny the above with all the earnestness of my soul. Listen! listen! Jesus says: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." "Marvel not that I said unto thee, *Ye must be born again.*" "*Except a man* [any one.—Gk.] *be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God*" (John 3:3-7).

And, in the face of all this, the Discipline and Bishop Merrill and Dr. Miller tell us that we all got into the kingdom of God without any new birth; we were just born into it when we were born of the flesh. Preposterous!

Paul says (1 Cor. 15:50): "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God;" that is, the kingdom of God is *not inherited* by *blood descent* like earthly kingdoms are sometimes inherited. I am not in the kingdom of God because my father was, any more than I am a Freemason because he was. If I am a Christian, I must be "born again," and if I am a Freemason, I must join the Masons for myself.

Henry Ward Beecher supposes some one to persist in demanding a Scripture text for this ordinance, and asks: "Where is your text for bap-

tizing children?" I reply: "There is none." And if I am asked, "Then, why do you baptize them?" I say: "Because it is found to be beneficial." And if men say to me, "Do you think the baptism of children a divine ordinance?" my reply is: "I believe an ox-yoke is a divine ordinance. When men found out that shaping a piece of wood across the neck of an ox was the way to get the use of his strength, that piece of wood became a divine ordinance."

Mr. Beecher was a great preacher, but his logic was sometimes lame. He contends for infant baptism on the ground of *utility,* the same as for the use of an ox-yoke. Does Mr. Beecher see no difference between using the ox-yoke in the name of *utility,* and using it in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost? Would he permit any one to yoke an ox in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost? Oh, no, certainly not! Then, why put water on the infant in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost? Let us put the ox-yoke on the ox in the *name of utility,* and put water on the infants in the *name of utility* also. Yes, sprinkle it on, pour it on, or immerse them in it —and *rub well. All in the name of utility!* but not in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Why, friends, *vaccination* is useful, and it is done because of its utility. But it is not done in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost; and it would be *blasphemous* to *vaccinate* a person

in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Neither should water be put on a child in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, for God never commanded it to be done.

Dr. E. Williams says: "The champions of infant baptism are by no means agreed upon the question. On what is the right of infants to baptism founded?"

Indeed, the confusion amongst pedobaptists on this question reminds me of the old stanza:

> "They wire in and wire out,
> And leave the people still in doubt
> Whether the snake that made the track
> Was going north or coming back."

What Is Infant Baptism For?

The Catholics, and some others, baptize infants to save them from original sin, to save them from being lost, or blotted out forever. They will not allow the dead body of an unbaptized infant to be buried in one of their cemeteries.

The Church of England says: "Baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, an inheriter of the kingdom of God."

Others give these (or additional) reasons for it, but they all lack God's command. It is not in the Bible. Hence, it is a surrender of our great maxim: "The Bible, only, contains our religion."

It makes impossible the Saviour's command to baptize the believer. (The infant has no faith.)

It is done in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and neither of them ever authorized it, therefore it is taking the name of God in vain.

It makes conversion unnecessary in order to get into the church (or kingdom of heaven, which is the same).

The Roman Catholic Church claims all baptized infants as belonging to her. This may be strange news to many of my readers. But listen to this:

Archbishop Purcell ("Campbell and Purcell Debate," p. 72, Cincinnati, 1837) says: "She [the Roman Catholic Church] counts, as belonging to her communion, all of the children baptized in Protestant communions, who die before they are capable of committing mortal sin, or who, living in invincible ignorance that they have been bred up in error, keep the commandments of God, and love him, as far as their knowledge of his divine nature will permit. All these belong to the soul of the church, and are consequently among the most precious of her fold."

Paul says: "And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath; but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord" (Eph. 6:4). "Nurture" means "to nourish," feed, train, discipline, educate. "Admonish" means to advise, exhort, warn, instruct, direct, guide. When the parent does these things, he has done his duty toward the child. It is worse than useless to do things which God has never commanded. Paul

says: "(Touch not; taste not; handle not; which all are to perish with the using;) after the commandments and doctrines of men" (Col. 2:21, 22).

Jesus says: "Go *teach* all nations, baptizing them," etc. There you see we must *teach first,* then baptize. With infant baptism it is just the reverse.

Jesus also says: "He that *believeth* and is *baptized* shall be *saved.*" Note the order of the words—*believeth, baptized, saved.* As *faith* comes by hearing the word of God, would it not be best to believe it just as the Word states it?

May God bless this message to the good of honest, inquiring men and women who have become entangled in the doctrines, traditions and commandments of men, is my prayer.

XI

WHAT IS BAPTISM?

TEXT.—"One Lord, one faith, one baptism."—Eph. 4: 5.

"Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid the water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts 10: 46-48—R. V.).

"Having been buried with him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead" (Col. 2: 12—R. V.).

NOTHING is ever settled until it is settled right," and no man's "think so" can be substituted for God's "say so."

Abraham Lincoln said: "Stand with anybody that stands right, stand with him while he is right, and part with him when he goes wrong."

Water baptism is practiced by all Christian denominations except the Friends (Quakers) and the Salvation Army (including the Volunteers of America).

We affirm that the immersion of a penitent believer, in water, into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, *and that alone*, is Scriptural baptism.

Christ was baptized but once, hence but one way. Whatever that way was is just what He meant for us to do when He commanded us to be baptized.

There are eighty-eight passages, and five allusions to the subject of baptism, in the New Testament—17 times in Matthew, 10 times in Mark, 12 times in Luke, 11 times in John, 23 times in Acts, 2 times in Romans, 8 times in 1 Corinthians, and once each in Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, 1 Peter and Hebrews.

The five allusions to baptism are as follows: John 3:5: "Born of water;" Heb. 10:22: "Bodies washed in pure water;" Tit. 3:5: "Washing of regeneration;" Rom. 6:5: "Planted in the likeness of his death;" Rom. 6:17: "Having obeyed . . . that form of doctrine."

My *first argument* in favor of immersion is the meaning of the Greek word *baptizo.* I shall quote ten or more of the leading Greek lexicons (dictionaries):

WALDERUS says: "*Baptizo—Immergo,* immerse."

STEPHENS says: "*Baptizo*—Immerse, submerge, bury in water, wash, bathe."

HEIDERICUS says: "*Baptizo*—Merge, immerse, bury in water, wash, bathe, baptize."

SCHLEUSNER (Glasgow, Vol. I., p. 338): "*Baptizo,* properly to immerse, to dip, to immerse in water."

GREEN: "*Baptizo*—To dip, to immerse."

GREENFIELD: "*Baptizo*—To immerse, to immerge, to submerge, to sink."

GROVES: "*Baptizo*—To dip, to immerse, to immerge, to plunge."

ROBINSON: "*Baptizo*—To dip in, to sink, to immerse."

DR. W. POPE (Berlin Gymnasium, 1880): "*Baptizo*—To dip in, to dip under."

LIDDELL AND SCOTT (seventh edition, p. 274): "To dip in or under water." On page 94 they say: "To dip repeatedly, to immerse, to submerge."

THAYER (Joseph Henry), Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation in Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.—Congregationalist):

"*Baptizo*—I. (1) Properly, to dip repeatedly, to immerge, to submerge.

"(2) To cleanse by dipping or submerging, to wash, to make clean with water.

"(3) Metaphorically, to overwhelm, to be overwhelmed with calamities, of those who must bear them.

"II. In the New Testament it is used particularly of the right of sacred ablution, first instituted by John the Baptist, afterwards by Christ's command received by Christians, and adjusted to the contents and nature of their religion. An immersion in water performed as a sign of the removal of sin, and administered to those who, im-

pelled by a desire for salvation, sought admission to the Messiah's kingdom.

"*Baptisma* (baptism): A word peculiar to the New Testament and ecclesiastical writings, immersion, submersion. (3) Of Christian baptism: this, according to the view of the apostles, is a rite of sacred immersion commanded by Christ."

I have given the definition quite fully as given by Thayer, for his lexicon is the standard, together with Liddell and Scott, now in most general use in all the colleges and universities of America.

If that is what the word means, then that is what *must* be done, in order to obey our Lord's command.

My second argument is the *testimony of celebrated pedobaptist scholars,* as to what baptism really is.

Charles Anthon, LL.D. (Episcopalian, Professor of Latin and Greek, Columbia College, New York). Of the word *baptizo,* he says: "The primary meaning is dip or immerse. Secondary, if it has any, refers to the same leading idea. Sprinkling is entirely out of the question."

Moses Stewart, D.D. (Congregationalist, Professor in Andover Theological Seminary), says: "*Bapto* and *baptizo* mean dip, plunge or immerse into any liquid" (*Mode of Baptism,* p. 51).

Rt. Rev. Dr. Trenan (Roman Catholic): "Plunged into the water. *Baptizo* strictly conveys this signification, as all the learned are agreed."

OLSHAUSEN (*Commentaries,* Vol. II., p. 265) says: "John was also baptizing in the neighborhood, because the water there, being deep, afforded convenience for immersion."

BISHOP JOHN LIGHTFOOT (*Whole Works,* Vol. XI., p. 63, and *Works,* Vol. II., p. 121) says: "That the baptism of John was by plunging the body seems to appear from those things related of him; namely, that he baptized in Jordan; that he baptized in Enon, because there was much water there; and that Christ, being baptized, came up out of the water, to which that seems to be parallel (Acts 8:38)."

MARTIN LUTHER (Vol. I., pp. 71 and 336; Vol. II., p. 19) says: "Baptism is a Greek word, and may be translated a dipping, as when we dip something into water, that it may be covered with water. . . . I would have those that are to be baptized to be wholly dipped into the water, as the word imports, and the mystery doth signify."

JOHN CALVIN says (*Institutes,* Book IV., Chap. XV., Sec. 19): "The very word 'baptize' signifies to immerse; and it is certain that immersion was the practice of the primitive church." On John 3:23 he says: "Here we perceive how baptism was administered among the ancients, for they immersed the whole body in water."

PHILIP SCHAFF (Presbyterian—President of Union Theological Seminary—*History of Apostolic Church,* pp. 568, 569) says: "Immersion, and not

sprinkling, was unquestionably the original normal form. This is shown by the very meaning of the Greek words *baptizo, baptisma, baptismos.* . . . Finally by the general usage of ecclesiastical antiquity, which was always immersion, as it is to this day in the Oriental and also in the Græco-Russian churches."

Dr. Brenner (Roman Catholic, in his book *Historical Exhibition of the Administration of Baptism,* p. 306) says: "Thirteen hundred years was baptism generally and regularly an immersion of the person under the water, and only in extraordinary cases a sprinkling or pouring with water; the latter was disputed as a mode of baptism (in the Catholic Church), nay, even forbidden."

Dean Stanley (Episcopalian, Dean of Westminster, and spiritual head of English Episcopal Church), in *Christian Institutions,* Harper's edition, page 17, says: "For the first thirteen centuries the almost universal practice of baptism was that of which we read in the New Testament, and which is the very meaning of the word 'baptize'—that those who were baptized were plunged, submerged, immersed into the water."

Such testimony as the above does not need any comment; the statements are clear and without equivocation.

My *third argument* is a consideration of the language used in the New Testament in describing the baptisms which are recorded therein.

The New Testament speaks of the following ten things:

(1) Water, (2) much water, (3) going to the water, (4) going down into the water, (5) coming up out of the water, (6) a "burial," (7) a "planting," (8) a "birth," (9) a "resurrection," (10) "bodies washed."

All the above are present in immersion, whereas only *one* of the ten is present in sprinkling and pouring; that is *water!*

With our knowledge of human nature and conduct, do you believe that if Christ had commanded sprinkling or pouring, men would ever have substituted immersion for it? Is it not more likely that they would substitute the easier for the more difficult, rather than the more difficult (immersion) for the easier (sprinkling)? Think over that matter.

The Change.

There has evidently been a change *sometime, somewhere,* by *somebody;* for we have a part of the world using immersion, and other portions using sprinkling or pouring. "Christ was baptized but once, hence but one way." If He was immersed, He was not sprinkled or poured, and *vice versa.* As we have affirmed that the *primitive baptism was immersion,* it will strengthen our contention to show *when, where* and *by whom* sprinkling and pouring were substituted for immersion.

The first case of sprinkling found in church history is that of Novatian, in the year 251 A. D. It is mentioned by Eusebius (who is called the "Father of Church History") as follows: "He [Novatian] falling into a grievous distemper, and it being supposed that he would die immediately, he received baptism, being [*perichuthis*] poured around with water on the bed whereon he lay, if that can be called baptism."

Now, this is the first mention of a substitute for immersion to be found in all the world, and it was without any authority from either God or man. They just did it without any authority whatever.

I will now give you an account of the first time *man* (the Pope) gave authority for the substitute. I quote from the Edinburgh Encyclopædia—Article, "Baptism" (by Sir Edward Brewster—Presbyterian):

"Pope Stephen III., being driven from Rome by Astolphus (or Aistulph), King of the Lombards in 753 A. D., fled to Pepin, who, a short time before, had usurped the crown of France. . . . While there the monks of Cressy inquired of him if, in case of necessity, it would be lawful, in baptizing, to pour water out of the hand, or cup, on the head of an infant?"

Before the Pope would answer this question, he required the priests to secure the promise of Pepin to take up his cause and expel the Lom-

bards from Italy. This they were able to do, as Pepin's throne was insecure, and a church alliance would help to strengthen it. The Pope then answered: "In case of necessity, such baptism should be held valid."

That is the first authority ever given on earth for sprinkling or pouring, and the Pope of Rome gives it. Truly it is the *Pope's baptism,* and not the baptism practiced and authorized by Christ and the apostles.

Listen to this from the Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol. III., page 351:

BAPTISM.—"The usual mode of performing the ceremony was by immersion. In the case of sick persons (*clinici*) the minister was allowed to baptize by pouring water upon the head, or by sprinkling. In the early [not primitive or apostolic—S. M.] church clinical baptism, as it was called, was only permitted in cases of necessity, but the practice of baptism by sprinkling gradually came in, in spite of opposing councils and hostile decrees. The Council of Ravenna in 1311 was the first council of the church [Roman Catholic] which legalized sprinkling by leaving it to the choice of the officiating minister."

Now, what do you think of that? First, Novatian had water poured over or around him in the year 251, *without any authority from either God or man.* Then Pope Stephen authorizes sprinkling or pouring of sick infants in 753, and the Roman

Catholic Council of Ravenna legalizes sprinkling and pouring by leaving it to the choice of the priest, in 1311.

Of course, the Catholic Church claims the right to make such changes, as you will see from the following article from the "Catholic Review," which says: "The Catholic Church, as the infallible custodian of the matter and form of the sacraments, claims the right to interpret them and modify them with accidental conditions. Up to the thirteenth century both the Greek and the Latin Churches used immersion in the solemn administration of baptism. In fact, our Lord and His apostles baptized with this rite. Christ himself was baptized in this way by St. John." This same writer says further:

"A change in the mode of baptism was made in the Latin Church in the thirteenth century. As we have already hinted, the Catholic Church claims the right to modify in accidentals the matter and form of the Sacraments."

Dr. Wm. Wall (Episcopalian, Vicar of Shoreham, Kent), in his "History of Infant Baptism," Vol. I., pages 570, 571, says: "Their general and ordinary way was to baptize by immersion. . . . This is so plain, by an infinite number of passages, that one can but pity the weak endeavors of such pedobaptists as would maintain the negative of it. . . . France seems to have been the first country in the world where baptism by affusion

was used ordinarily to persons in health and in the public way of administering it. . . . *Sprinkling* was really introduced (in France first, and then in other popish countries) in times of popery; and accordingly, all those countries in which the usurped power of the Pope is, or has been formerly, owned, left off dipping children in the fount; but that all other countries in the world which had never regarded his authority do still use immersion."

Listen to this from the great Dr. Gale: "All men know that baptism used to be administered in England by dipping or immersion, till Queen Elizabeth's time—1558—since which time that pure, primitive manner has grown into a total disuse within a little more than one hundred years; and sprinkling, the most opposite to it imaginable, introduced in its stead. The fact is notorious."

Have You Been Baptized?

Marcus Aurelius (Antoninus) says: "I seek the truth, by which no man was ever injured. But he is injured who abides in his error and ignorance."

Josiah Strong says: "As long as truth is truth, it does make some difference what men believe."

Gladstone said: "I will adopt new views as fast as they prove to be true views."

What Is Baptism?

The importance of the ordinance of baptism is sufficient reason for the discussion of this question.

There are some who very confidently affirm that baptism has nothing whatever to do with salvation, and hence it does not matter how it is done, or whether it is done at all.

I think we should be very careful here. Jesus walked about sixty or seventy miles that He might be baptized, and said: "Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." Do you think you can fulfill all righteousness and omit baptism? Peter said: "Repent, and *be baptized* every one of you . . . for the remission of sins." Jesus said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." There baptism is connected directly with salvation. Peter says: "Wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water: the like figure whereunto even baptism doth now *save* us" (1 Pet. 3: 20, 21).

Baptism is the only thing that we are commanded to perform in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and it must be an awful sin to speak or think lightly of a command which God has thus honored and dignified. There is not another thing in the Bible that we are authorized to do in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

XII

THE COMMUNION, OR THE LORD'S SUPPER

TEXTS.—"This do in remembrance of me."—1 Cor. 2: 24; Luke 22: 19.

THE following are all the references I find on this important subject in the New Testament: Matt. 26: 26-30; Mark 14: 1-27; Luke 22: 14-21; Acts 2: 42; 20: 7; 1 Cor. 10: 16, 17; 11: 23-34; Heb. 10: 25.

In none of these do we find any mention of "open communion," "close communion," "free," "mixed" or "restricted" communion.

Unscriptural words usually convey unscriptural ideas. I practice communion, but neither "open" nor "close," both of which involve the examination of another, and I am instructed to examine myself, and so eat and drink (1 Cor. 11: 28). I do not invite any one, nor debar any one. I myself am only an invited guest.

ERRORS AND INNOVATIONS.

Corruptions and innovations found their way into the church very early, even while the apostles

were still on earth. Corrupt practices and false doctrines found place in the church; many of these are denounced in the apostolic epistles. The Lord's Supper did not escape abuse. The night in which our Saviour was betrayed, after the supper in the upper room, He first took a loaf (this was doubtless a loaf of unleavened bread); He gave thanks, brake it, and said: "Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me" (1 Cor. 11:24). "After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me" (1 Cor. 11:25). We believe this to have contained the unfermented "fruit of the vine." It is never called wine in the New Testament. While I do not think that a communion would be nullified by the use of fermented wine, or of bread with yeast in it, still we think it is safer to use the other, though not indispensable to a true communion.

Of the origin of close communion, Geo. P. Fisher, of Yale College ("Church History," p. 66), says: "Toward the conclusion of the second century we find it to be the custom to exclude non-communicants from being present at the Lord's Supper. After the preliminary services, at the close of the addresses by the bishop and presbyters, the unbaptized were dismissed. From the Latin word signifying dismissal (*missa*) the word 'mass' is derived."

From the language of Jesus, "This is my body, this is my blood," was evolved the doctrine of tran-sub-stan-ti-a-tion. "In the ninth century, the doctrine of transubstantiation began to be talked of commonly, but was made infallible by Pope Innocent III., in the Fourth Lateran Council —1215" ("Campbell-Purcell Debate," p. 277). The Council of Trent, Canon 6, curses any who affirm that it is a human invention (1545-1563). Let us examine this false teaching.

This doctrine affirms the instantaneous, miraculous change of the elements, from *bread* and *wine*, to the *flesh* and *blood* ("body, blood, soul and divinity") of Jesus Christ.

In fact, Rome teaches that there is a series of intangible miracles attending upon it. I quote below from a recent publication (1915) used as a text-book in Catholic schools, "Manual of Christian Doctrine," authorized English version, by Joseph McVay, pages 423-4:

"Question 41—How does the eucharist manifest God's power?"

"Answer—It is a compendium of miracles, among which we may note the following:

"(1) The change of the substance of bread and wine into that of the body and the blood of Jesus Christ.

"(2) The return of the species, when they are corrupted, to the substance in which they naturally belong.

"(3) The remaining of the accidents, or appearances, of bread and wine, after the bread and wine have ceased to exist.

"(4) The remaining of the qualities of the sensible species, just as if their substance had not been changed.

"(5) The presence of Jesus Christ at the same time in heaven and under the sacramental species in a multitude of different places.

"(6) The presence of Jesus Christ, whole and entire and living, under the sacred species.

"(7) The presence in the holy eucharist of the three persons of the Blessed Trinity as a consequence of the union of the person of Jesus Christ with the person of the Son of God, and the union of the Son of God with the Father and the Holy Ghost.

"(8) The spiritual manner in which our Lord exists under the sacred species, where he is whole and entire under every part, although he has but a single existence.

"(9) The multiplication of his presence in every particle of the species, however small it may be.

"(10) The withdrawal of his presence when the species corrupt."

All this "theology" grows out of a literal interpretation of Christ's words, which should be taken in a symbol; just as when He said: "I am the door—the vine—the bread—the rock—the

water—the light—the way." And "go tell that *fox*" (Herod). The "bread" and "cup" symbolized His body broken, and His blood shed, for us.

Consubstantiation is equally incorrect. Webster (Dict.) says: "The Lutherans maintain that after consecration of the elements, the body and blood of Christ are substantially present with the substance of the bread and wine . . . each unchanged in its substance, and without substantial conjunction."

Who Should Commune?

The religious world is practically united in answer to this question. Answer: Baptized Believers.

Justin Martyr says: "It is not lawful for any to partake . . . but such as believe and have been baptized."

Theophylact says: "No unbaptized person partakes of the Lord's Supper."

Lord Chancellor King says: "Baptism was always the precedent of the Lord's Supper, and none were admitted . . . till they were baptized."

Dr. Wall says: "No church ever gave the communion to any persons before they were baptized. Among all the absurdities that ever were held, none ever maintained that any should partake of the communion before they were baptized."

Drs. Doddridge and Dwight, two eminent Congregational scholars, say: "It is certain, so far as

our knowledge of antiquity extends, that no unbaptized person received the Lord's Supper."

This does not mean that those who do commune should assume responsibility and set themselves to judge and exclude the unbaptized; but if an unbaptized person should eat and drink, it would not be a true communion, that is all.

You should not refuse to commune because some other person is doing so whom you judge to be unworthy. When you partake, you are neither approving nor disapproving of others. In fact, you are not communing *with* them, but with the Lord. You examine yourself, and let others do the same. Don't think of them; you think of Christ.

How Frequently Should We Commune?

We answer: Once a week, on the first day of the week.

Luke says: "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached to them" (Acts 20:7).

The purpose of their meeting on that day was to "break bread." Paul's preaching was incidental. He had waited there for six days for the occasion of their coming together, that he might speak to them. He had arrived at Troas from Philippi on Monday, and waited until the next Sunday (first day of the week), when he preached to them, and continued his speech until after midnight, and until break of day, and then departed.

Adam Clark says: "Concerning the phrase 'to break bread,' intimating by this that they were accustomed to receive the holy sacrament on each Lord's Day."

Dr. Scott (Presbyterian) says: "This ordinance seems to have been constantly administered every Lord's Day, and probably no professed Christians absented themselves from it after they had been admitted into the church."

Dr. Mason (Presbyterian) says: "The Lord's Supper was observed by the first Christians every Lord's Day; nor will this be denied by any man who has candidly investigated the subject. . . . There is a cloud of witnesses to testify that they were kept up by succeeding Christians, with great care and tenderness, for above two centuries."

Dr. Doddridge (Congregationalist) says: "It is well known that the primitive Christians administered the Eucharist every Lord's Day."

Dr. J. M. Cramp (Baptist), Nova Scotia, says: "The death of our Saviour is specially commemorated in the Lord's Supper, which, it is well known, was observed by the primitive churches every Lord's Day."

Alexander Carson (Baptist) says: "There is an admirable wisdom in the appointment of Jesus in the observance of the Lord's Supper every first day of the week. Would it be any loss to them if all the churches of Christ were to return to this primitive practice?"

I will next quote from John Wesley. In his "Letter to America," 1784, he says: "I also advise the elders to administer the supper of the Lord every Lord's Day. With respect to this or any other command, he that, when he may obey it if he will, does not, will have no place in the kingdom of heaven."

If I had spoken thus, some might have taken offense. But John Calvin is even more harsh respecting the neglect of this ordinance. John Calvin says: "And truly this custom, which enjoins communing once a year, is a most evident contrivance of the devil, by whose instrumentality soever it may have been determined. . . . It ought to have been far otherwise. Every week, at least, the table of the Lord should have been spread, and the promises declared, by which, in partaking of it, we might be spiritually fed."

R. A. Torrey (president Moody Bible Institute, Chicago), in a personal letter to B. B. Tyler, of Denver, Colorado, January 31, 1899, says: "It is true that I personally believe that the Lord's Supper ought to be partaken of every Lord's Day, and have said so in the church, and presume have said so in the lecture-room."

So far as I know, there is not a dissenting voice to the above testimony. If there is a scholar, or church historian in the world who denies it, I do not know it. Do you know of any such denial?

In the growth of the Apostasy the Lord's Supper was changed to "the mass," and multiplied, in its observance, from once a week to many times a week, and hundreds of times in a year, instead of fifty-two times in the year.

The Protestant Reformation swung to the opposite extremity, and observed it once a month, once in three months, once in six months, once a year, or discarded it altogether, as in some churches.

Why not return to the primitive, apostolic practice of *once on every first day of the week?* It is a commemorative institution, and once a week is not too often to "do this in remembrance of me."

The following adaptation of "The Prodigal Son" will illustrate the purpose and value of the Lord's Supper.

You may have belonged to one of the good old-fashioned families where there were from six to sixteen in the family, before the days of telephones, telegraph, railroads and automobiles. Families did not become scattered then as now, but, marrying, would settle down close to the "old folks," and reunions were frequent and happy. Sunday was the day when, after going to church, all would meet at the old home for dinner and a visit together. This continues for many years, while father and mother grow old, and failing health and infirmity mark the approaching end. Then a serious illness and the sad message comes:

"Father is dead." The family and friends all gather to show their love and respect for the dear old father, friend and neighbor. His body is laid tenderly to rest in the family lot of the little churchyard not far away, and all return sorrowfully to their homes. The next Sunday comes, and all gather at the "old home," for mother is still there. Poor, lonely, heart-broken, mourning mother! Silence prevails; sadness reigns. Before the return home that day, they all visit the church, and gather around the new-made grave, and the fountain of tears is opened again. They are *remembering father*—his love, his sacrifice; how he bared his arm to toil, his breast to danger for them —his children. This is repeated every Sunday, as a few more years pass swiftly by. Then comes the saddest news that earth can bring: *"Mother is dead."* Dear, sweet, patient, loving mother is gone! Her body is laid by the side of father, and the next Sunday comes. But the family does not gather at the "old home." Ah! it is home no more. Mother is not there. As long as mother lives, that place where her love is, is home; but when she is gone, it is home no longer. Her death breaks up that home forever. How many have felt this truth! The best that can be done now is to go to her grave and weep there. Accordingly, they all meet at her grave and stand about, sobbing out the grief of their bereaved hearts. But look! Some one is approaching. Who is it? It

is "Bill." Who is Bill? Bill is the prodigal son. He is the "black sheep" of the family. He was not at home when mother died, and no one knew or cared where he was. But he has heard that his mother is dead, and is going to her grave. One of his sisters says: "Oh, John, don't let him come here. He broke poor mother's heart, and he has disgraced us all. Don't let him come." But sister Mary says: "Oh, let him come, let him come! Mother loved him. I heard her praying for her 'poor, wandering Willie' just before she passed away. Let him come. It will not hurt mother, and may do him good." He comes; they give place, and poor Bill throws himself down on the grave of his mother, and who can describe the bitterness of his wail? "Oh, mother! my mother! The only friend I had in all the world, and you are gone! Oh, what will I do? No one that cares for me now!" Sister Mary bends over him and tells him that Jesus loves him, and that mother has gone to be with Jesus. The poor boy rises, and vows that, by the help of mother's God, her prayers shall yet be answered; and he goes forth to begin the struggle for a better life. Would you drive that boy from his mother's grave? Her love invites him to come. No one wants to be forgotten by those whom he loves.

Jesus loves us, and wants us to remember Him. We can not visit His grave. He knew that He would rise and go to His Father. But He left this

memorial of His body and His blood, and we can gather about this table, as children at the grave of their mother, and remember His love, His sacrifice, His service, and, with penitential tears, renew our vows of faithfulness. Oh, blessed Saviour, help us to remember Thee! Once a week is not too often. You would not think it too often for a wayward boy to visit the grave of his departed mother—not if it were *your* boy.

We do not commune because we are good, but in remembrance of One who is good; that we may become more like Him, whose love led Him to die for us. "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show [proclaim—R. V.] the Lord's death *till he come*" (1 Cor. 11:26).

XIII

OPPORTUNITY

TEXT.—"As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith."—Gal. 6: 10.

CHRISTIANS are debtors to the whole world, but we have special obligations to those who constitute the family of God. I am expected to do good to my neighbor, but must do even more for my own family.

We question the sincerity of the man who is more considerate of others than of his own family. So also of the Christian who is indifferent toward the church and its members.

Opportunity is from *opportune,* meaning seasonable, timely, fit or becoming. Shakespeare says: "There is a tide in the affairs of men, which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune; omitted, all the voyage of their life is bound in shallows and in miseries" ("Julius Cæsar," Act IV., Scene 3).

All opportunity is for good, and all opportunity is for evil. There is no such thing as an exclusive

opportunity for either good or evil. Like a silver dollar, every opportunity has two sides. When one is turned to you, the other is turned from you. The opportunity which is a blessing to one man may be a curse to another, just as a dollar may be a blessing to one and a curse to another, owing to the use made of it.

Every day and every hour of life are crowded with opportunities. What use are you making of them? Do not wait for opportunity, like Wilkins Micawber, but take a flying leap and mount this Pegasus as he flies past; he never stops and he never returns.

"The opportunity of a lifetime must be seized during the lifetime of the opportunity." Oliver Cromwell said it was not only his business to strike while the iron was hot, but to make the iron hot by striking it!

We have opportunities to be true to ourselves. The person who is not true to himself can not be trusted with the welfare of others. "To thyself be true, and it must follow as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man." An old Scotch proverb says: "Be a frind to yersil, and ithers will." A young man who does not care enough for himself and his family to behave himself, and honor his name, can not be trusted with the affairs of others. He will never be truer to others than to himself or to his own family. Young women should never marry men of bad morals

and reputation, with the idea that they can then reform such men. A man of this character will never be more considerate of you and your good name than he has been of that of his own family. The man who will rob himself will rob you, if he has the chance.

We have opportunity to correct our bad habits. These, like Dante's she-wolf, lean and lank, gaunt and hungry, stand in the path before you, and challenge your progress. Face them with the courage of a man; they will cower and slink away, and you can pass on to the goal.

Demosthenes, the greatest orator the world has ever known, had four bad habits of delivery which made his speech so ridiculous that he was laughed to scorn. Rawlinson, in his "Ancient History," tells us that Demosthenes stuttered, had weakness of voice, shortness of breath, and constantly shrugged his shoulders, as if pumping out his words. He was humiliated by his failure, but not discouraged. He at once began the task of overcoming these bad habits. He declaimed with pebbles in his mouth, and overcame his stammering; with a sword (or thorn-bush) suspended above his shoulder, he overcame the shrugging; then on the seashore to strengthen the voice until he could be heard above the roar of the storm; then as he ran up-hill, until the breath control was gained. Again he appears before the populace with the same message as before, and now they listen. *Demosthenes*

is master of the world! Because DEMOSTHENES IS MASTER OF HIMSELF!

We have opportunity to repair any wrongs we have done to others. Do not worry about what others have done *to* you, let them worry over that; you will not have to answer for that. You repent of, and make restitution for your own wrong-doing, and do so now. Two newsboys in St. Louis were having a "scrap," and one of them was run over by a heavy truck, and fatally injured. He was taken to the old city hospital. The next day an urchin was seen loitering about the entrance, when an attendant asked him what he wanted. He said he wanted to see "Billy." "Who is 'Billy'?" "He's the kid that was run down by the truck yesterday on Pine Street." He would not give his name or tell where he lived. He doubtless feared that in some way he was to blame for the accident, and the injury to his little friend. He was not permitted to go in, but he took an apple from his pocket and told them to give it to Billy. The next day he returned with similar results. He gave an orange, asking that it be given to Billy. The third day he returned, and, as no one else had called, or made any inquiry, they told the boy that he might come in and see his little friend; that the doctors had said that he could not get well, he was so badly hurt. When he reached the ward to which the injured lad had been taken he looked around until he saw the cot on which

he lay, and, going to it, he burst into tears and said: "Oh, Billy, I want ye to fergiv' me. I want ye to fergiv' me 'fore it's too late. The doc says ye can't git well, and I'm so sorry fer scrappin' with ye." The other replied: "Don't cry. I was to blame as much as you. I fergiv' ye. Don't cry. I ain't afraid to die. I ain't got anybody to care fer me; no father, no mother, nor nobody. My mother's dead, and pa don't care about me. Nurse told me about heaven last night, and how nice it is there, and I want to go there. I prayed last night too. Did you ever pray? I prayed for me and I prayed for you, too, 'cause you ain't got anybody either. Don't cry—don't—cry." And thus they talked until the brief visit ended.

The next day the little boy was dead. His sorrowing friend was permitted to ride on the dead-wagon that took the body to the potter's field. He stood by until the grave was filled, and threw himself down upon it, and said: "Oh, Billy, I'm so glad you fergiv' me 'fore ye died."

The reporter who gave this story to the press closed with this sentence: "If, under the crust of vice and poverty, there are such streams of pure nobility as this, who of us should weary in doing good?"

"A diamond in the rough
Is a diamond sure enough,
For before it ever sparkles
It is made of diamond stuff.

"Of course some one must find it,
Or it never will be found;
And some one else must grind it,
Or it never will be ground.

"But when it's found, and when it's ground,
And when it's burnished bright,
That diamond everlastingly
Just sparkles out its light."

One of my best-remembered Sunday-school teachers was an elder of the church, and he understood boys. I was about twelve years of age. Lesson leaves were not in use in those days, so we just read out of the New Testament. We were reading the tenth chapter of Matthew, and one of the boys, having laboriously read the last verse, "And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only, in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you he shall in no wise lose his reward," our teacher took off his glasses, and said: "Boys, I am going to tell you a story of the war, which has to do with this verse of Scripture." And he told the following, which I have never forgotten.

"I had a brother who was a Union soldier away down in Dixie. Our boys were camped near a big Southern mansion on a Southern cotton plantation. Only the women and a few negroes were left about the place, and the soldiers would slip through the lines at night and steal eggs and chickens, and milk the cows, etc., much to the annoyance of these

women. One of these women came to the camp and complained, to the commander, of such treatment, and a guard was placed about the premises. My brother was sent to patrol the lawn in front of the big house. He was not feeling well, and when one of the women came out on the veranda he asked her if she would be kind enough to give him a drink of cold water. She replied: 'No, I'll not bring you any water. You Yankees come down here and take everything we've got, and want to free our niggers, and then want us to be niggers for you! I'll do nothing of the kind.'' My brother, in reply to her abuse, just quoted this verse of Scripture. She stood still until he had finished it, and then said: 'Are you a disciple?' He said: 'I am.' The woman went back into the house and presently returned with a pitcher of cold water, and said: 'Oh, brother, forgive me. I, too, am a disciple, a member of the Christian Church, and I know better than to act as I did, but we are so tried and hurt by this awful war, that we forget our religion, and our Saviour, too, at times.' My brother told her that he was ill, and she said that she would go to the camp and report his illness, and have him relieved. My brother protested, but she insisted, and went and reported, and then requested the privilege of taking my brother into the home and caring for him, inasmuch as they were members of the same church. Permission was granted, and those good Southern

women nursed my brother for six weeks through a siege of typhoid fever."

Those were the first kind words I had ever heard spoken of Southern people. I had thought them inhuman monsters, both men and women. Dixie seemed so far away, and all Southern people so wicked and bad. But I know them now, and how I love them! No better people live on this earth than the people of the Southland. And, do you know, I think God knew that I would some day be a preacher and travel all over this great country, and that he had that story planted in my mind and heart in order that, wherever I should preach "in the whole world, this should be spoken of as a memorial of her" (Mark 14:3-9).

We, as Christians, have opportunity, when we sin or do wrong, to repent, and to forgive any who may have wronged us, and to pray then (and not till then) for our own forgiveness. "And when ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have aught against any: that your Father also which is in heaven may forgive your trespasses. But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in heaven forgive your trespasses" (Mark 11:25, 26). "And forgive us our debts [sins] as we forgive our debtors [*i. e.*, those who sin against us]" (Matt. 6:12).

We have opportunity, in our homes, of setting a good example. Some men admonish their boys to keep out of bad company, and when they are

with their own fathers they are in the worst company in town, for he *smokes, drinks, chews, lies, swears* and *gambles.*

A little boy walking through deep snow, following his father, fell down again and again. At last his father, picking him up, said: "What's the matter with you that you can't stand up?" "Why, papa, I was a-steppin' in your tracks." Comment is unnecessary.

We should also teach the word of God in the family. The admonitions and suggestions of a father will be remembered in later years when the words of the preacher are forgotten. We should teach and suggest good things to boys and girls wherever we go. Gipsy Smith tells of his first visit to America, in 1889, when Ira D. Sankey took him for a long drive on Saturday before his first service. Smith asked Sankey if he remembered when he and Mr. Moody were in England, in their campaign at Burdett Road Bow, that they were driven out to the gipsy camp in Epping Forest. "Yes, I remember it very well, and I remember meeting the Smith brothers, who were doing a good evangelistic work up and down your country." "One of those brothers, Cornelius Smith, was my father. Do you remember that some little gipsy boys stood on the wheel of the trap in which you were driving, and, leaning over, you put your hand on the head of one of them and said: 'The Lord make a preacher of you, my boy'?" "Yes,"

said Sankey, "I remember that too." "I am that boy." "Mr. Sankey's joy knew no bounds" (Smith's "Autobiography," p. 169).

You have opportunity to encourage others in the church, the Bible school, prayer-meeting, Endeavor society, missionary and aid societies, and last, but not least, the preacher. The poor man often needs it, when he is oppressed, discouraged, and heartsore with the care of the church, and the anxiety incident thereto. But no one comes to share the burden or even to tell him that he is praying for him, and that he appreciates his efforts and enjoys his sermons. Don't be afraid of spoiling your preacher with praise and deserved compliments. W. H. Book says: "More preachers die of frostbite than of sunstroke!"

I called one morning on a hard-working, conscientious minister, the pastor of a large congregation, and he invited me to go calling with him. It was a crisp October morning, and as we walked out, he said: "I am going to call this morning on some families who seldom go to church, but who have many excuses, and find fault with the church and preacher, and everybody else except themselves."

We came to the first place, turned in at the little gate, and knocked at the door. Great commotion within—chairs knocked over, children rushed out the back way, and then the broom brought into vigorous action, while we stood and

knocked and waited. At last the door was opened, and we were invited into the stifling room. I was introduced, and we sat down. And that woman turned loose her "machine-gun tongue" about as follows: "Well, I'm powerful glad to see you [lie, of course]! It's so long since you called on us, I hardly knew you! Didn't you know I'd been sick, and pa's been sick, and the children's been sick too. And none of you ever come to us. We might all 'a' died and none of the church-members would 'a' cared, or ever knowed it. I don't see what's the good of the church, or what's the use of belongin' to it, nohow."

The preacher tried to explain, and apologize for both the members and himself; said none of them knew of any illness in the family, etc. "No, that's it; you never know anything. If you'd come around a little oftener, you might find out something!" We departed, and her last shot expressed the hope that they might not all be dead and buried before he got around again.

We went on to the next place. We got in sooner, but we got into a worse place, for there were two women and a man there, and they all jumped onto the preacher and the church, and what one couldn't think of and say, the others did.

We went on that way with but slight variation until noon, when we returned to his home and study. He sat down in his Morris chair, weary and exhausted. After a short silence, he said:

"Well, Bro. Martin, what do you think of it?" "Think?" I said. "That's all I've been doing all forenoon. I haven't had a chance to say anything. I don't think you know how to manage the kind of 'cattle' [sheep—and sheep are cattle] we've been calling on to-day." He said: "How would you manage them?" I replied: "I'd do it different; your way is a failure. Mine might fail too, but I wouldn't let that bunch run over me, and abuse me and the whole church, like you did. Now, take that first place, for example, where the children all rushed out the back way, and the woman swept the floor before she let us in. I would have knocked and then opened the door and rushed right in, and grabbed those youngsters when they started to run, and said: 'Hold on, children, bless your little hearts. I just came in to see what's the matter, that you don't come to Sunday school. And, sister, I haven't seen you or your husband at church or prayer-meeting for so long I can't remember. Why don't you come? Why don't you send these children to Sunday school? Have you been helping any of the poor around here? Have you been down to see that sick man in the next block, and poor old Sister Jones just around the corner? You claim to be a Christian—a church-member! Do you give thanks at the table, or have Bible reading and family prayer? Are you doing anything for the Lord, yourself, or anybody else?' I'd just pour

in the questions so thick and fast, and so lay bare her hypocritical life, that she wouldn't get a chance to put a word in edgeways. I'd put her on the defensive, and then leave before she had a chance to make any reply; and, as I departed, I'd say: 'Now, children, I'm going to look for you at Sunday school to-morrow morning, and if you are not there, I'll be down here again early Monday morning to see what's the matter. Now, sister, you get busy! Good-by! God bless you'—and away I'd go, before she had a chance to get her breath."

The preacher laughed, and asked: "Do you think that would straighten them out, and bring them to church and the children to Sunday school?" I replied, "No!" "Then, what next?" "Well, I'd do as I said. I'd go down there bright and early Monday morning, walk up and knock hard on the door, and open—ah! it's locked! and the blinds are drawn! I'd knock louder, and listen —they are in there, but they don't want me to know it. They would be like the old darky who used to pray every night, 'O Lord, send yo' angel, and take pore old Sam home; I'se ready, Lord; send yo' angel.' One night some one knocked on his door just as he made that prayer. 'Who's dat?' 'It's the angel of the Lord, come to take Sam to heaven.' He jumped into bed, covered up his head, and said: 'Go 'long, angel; dat nigger done moved away from here long 'go.'"

Don't find fault with the preacher. You don't honor yourself nor help him. If you appreciate his service and sermons, say so, and even when you do not enjoy it, the trouble may be with yourself. Appetite has much to do with the enjoyment of the feast.

When your heart is breaking, and the sad days come, and the funeral train moves on, you don't send for the dancing, card-playing, theater-going, godless bunch. You send for the preacher then. You spend your time and money with the devil's crowd, but you want the preacher to come and share your grief and sorrow.

It is a sin to neglect our opportunities. They do not last long, and seldom return, except to mock us.

The greatest of all opportunities is that of accepting the salvation offered us in Christ Jesus. "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" Accept now. "Behold, now is the day of salvation" (2 Cor. 6:2). "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" (Heb. 2:3).

XIV

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

TEXT.—"What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."—Mark 10: 9.

MARRIAGE, legally defined, is the union of a man and a woman in the relation of husband and wife, including both the act, or ceremony, which creates the union, and the union itself, as the resulting state.

It is a *contract,* but Judge Story says: "It is more than a contract; it is an institution founded upon the consent and contract of the parties, and has peculiarities in its nature, character and operation, different from what belongs to ordinary contracts."

As love should always accompany marriage, and never forsake that relationship, a prelude on love may well introduce the subject.

Emerson says: "Cupid is a *Casuist,* a *Mystic* and a *Cabalist.*"

Love—who can define it? Not I. And yet I say, it is the motor of earth and of heaven; the greatest, the best, the most enduring thing in the

universe. "God is love." "And now abideth faith, hope, *love;* and the greatest of these is *love.*" "Everybody loves a lover."

There are many kinds of love, each taking its name and deriving its quality from the *person* or *thing* loved; as, mother love, parental love, filial love, love of country, love of home, love of good, love of sin, love of nature, love of music, love of beauty, love of life, and the love of the boy and the girl, the man and the woman, for each other, forming the basis and supplying the inspiration of true marriage and happy homes.

Sexuality is the basis of the love that "rings the wedding-bells" and "builds the home"; while *sensuality* gets *married,* and then furnishes the eternal grist for the *divorce mill,* with its blasted hopes and ruined homes.

Courtship is a season of ecstatic delight, and ofttimes of painful anxiety, which should end (neither too soon nor too late) in the selection of a suitable life companion.

"Love at first sight," with hasty marriage, is, almost without exception, disastrous. "A happy-go-lucky marriage is seldom lucky enough to be happy" (*John E. Pounds*). I once heard of a man who courted a lady for twenty years, and when asked why he did not marry her, replied: "Where would I then spend my evenings?"

The selection of a husband or wife may determine whether you are to have TWO HEAVENS or

TWO HELLS—heaven here and hereafter, or hell now and forever.

You should seek and take all the good advice you can get *before* marriage. Love makes fools of most people. We have very little sense or judgment when in love. I have been offering, for twenty-five years, to exchange photographs with any person who had never acted the fool when in love. *Not one exchange has yet been made!*

We can not tarry at the wedding, with its many pleasant and amusing accompaniments, which is usually an occasion of considerable embarrassment to the principals, and sometimes to the officiating minister.

A very dear friend of mine, when called upon to solemnize his first marriage, carefully prepared what he thought would prove an impressive ceremony. He memorized it thoroughly, but when the critical moment came he forgot it and broke down completely. A painful silence ensued, which he finally broke by saying: "By the authority of God Almighty, I pronounce you *man* and *woman!* The friends will now come up and view the remains."

CONSENT is the essence of valid marriage; hence persons who have not legal control of themselves can not marry—that is, *idiots, insane persons* and *minor children*—without the consent of parent or guardian.

We have *void* and *voidable* marriages. *Void* marriages do not require a formal divorce to set

them aside, such as bigamy, polygamy, or marriage within the forbidden limits of blood relationship. A proof of these proves no marriage could exist. At the same time, *minority, insanity, idiocy, impotency* or *fraud* renders the marriage *voidable.* A voidable marriage is *valid* unless it is pronounced *void* by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Just here you may discover a very simple and quiet way of securing a divorce: Apply for it on the ground of *insanity* or *idiocy,* and when the case is called, present yourself as *prima-facie* evidence of the allegation. "At first view" the judge will see that no sane person would have married you. The decree will be granted!

Marriage forms the basis of all good society, pure homes and honorable parentage. Promiscuity ("free love") curses society, destroys home and dishonors posterity. "*The strength of a nation depends upon the morality of its people.*"

Who May Marry?

The following persons *may* marry; it is not compulsory:

1. Those who have never been married, and have no legal disqualifications.

2. Those who have been married once, or oftener, but whose companion is dead. But if you are a Christian, you should marry no one who is not also a Christian. "The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her hus-

band be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; *only in the Lord*" (1 Cor. 7:39). Paul said he spoke this by permission of the Lord. You can readily see the wisdom of such advice. If you are a Christian *widow,* with or without orphan children, you will run less risk in marrying a good, Christian man, than in marrying a heathen, or an infidel. The same is true if you are a Christian widower. A Christian wife and stepmother to your motherless little ones is a consideration that should never be disregarded in second marriages, for no one needs the grace of God more than a second wife and a stepmother.

3. The Christian man or woman who is deserted by an unbelieving wife or husband. "But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases" (1 Cor. 7:15).

4. The *innocent party* in divorce, for the one cause of adultery, or fornication. The guilty party has no Scriptural right to marry again, and if both were guilty, neither one can marry again without adultery. "And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery" (Matt. 19:9). You see, God does not put a premium on sin.

Divorce is the dissolution of the marriage relation for due cause shown. There were four hun-

dred thousand *legal* divorces last year, but not many of these were Scriptural. I believe most of these should have taken the form of "legal separations," without the right or privilege of remarriage. This would break up the vicious home atmosphere and save the children from its contaminating influence, as well as prevent others being born into such unhappy homes.

CAUSES OF DIVORCE.

1. Matching without mating.

"Who weds for love alone may not be wise;
Who weds without it, angels must despise."
—*Ella Wheeler Wilcox.*

2. Girls should not marry old men for money, or just to get a home. A girl in her teens or twenties, who marries a man in his sixties or seventies, is a willing victim of the white-slave traffic. The old man who marries a young girl is a fool.

No young girl will marry an old man unless he has money. She has but one ambition, and that is to become his *widow*—as soon as possible! But she will be disappointed, for these old fools never die.

3. You rich American girls should not marry "titled renegades" from "across the waters." These foreign dukes, barons, counts and viscounts are all "no accounts"! Don't you know that all of them who are at all worth marrying are

"gobbled up" by the eligible "ladies of rank" in their own countries? You never have a chance at anything but the "*culls.*" The only title worth wearing is the one you win, not the one you marry or *buy.*

William Jennings Bryan says: "And let me say right here, too, to any American girl who thinks of getting a foreign title, that one American boy, of good health, education and high morals, is far better than all the remnants of European aristocracy she could buy with all her millions."

I think these American lads will take you in spite of your wealth, and love you for yourself alone.

4. A most fruitful source of divorce is "disobedient wives" and "unloving husbands." "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the saviour of the body. Therefore, as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything" (Eph. 5:22-24). "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord" (Col. 3:18).

No woman should marry a man whom she is unwilling to obey, just as no one should assume the name "Christian" unless he obeys Christ. "Husbands, *love* your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; . . . So ought men to love their wives as their own

bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself. . . . For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh" (Eph. 5:25-31). "Husbands, love your wives, and never treat them harshly" (Col. 3:19). (Quoted from "Twentieth Century New Testament.")

5. Too great haste in contracting marriage is another cause for divorce. I heard of an undertaker who proposed marriage to the widow on the way home from the funeral of her husband. She said: "No, I can't marry you." He insisted, when she replied: "No, no, I can not marry you; I am already engaged to the man who sat up with the corpse."

You *should* marry. I have no patience with selfish, cowardly old bachelors. They are often nuisances and sources of demoralization. They ought to be taxed to support old maids and orphan children.

There are, however, two classes of men whom I excuse from marriage: First, the elder brother who denies himself the privilege of marriage in order to help his mother rear and care for the family of little ones left orphans by the death or desertion of the father. Such a boy is a hero.

I also excuse the man who has tried his best to get married, and no woman would have him!

The same reasons apply in the case of old maids.

Is Marriage a Failure?

In many cases it is a failure, but as an institution it is not, as no substitute for it has ever been a success.

Marriage is a disappointment to many, perhaps to most, people. I know it was to me. I was expecting too much. I am now going to make a *shocking statement:* If I had known my wife as well before I married her, as afterwards, I never would have married her. I first made that statement in San Francisco, before six hundred people, and in the presence of my wife. How do you suppose I squared myself with that crowd—and with Mary? Why, by telling more truth. You see, when I started out to find a wife, I was looking for a *perfect woman.* Nothing else would do for me. I met, and fell in love with, first one and then another, finding imperfections in each one. One after the other I would drop them, to find another and another, each and all imperfect. This finding and dropping went on for several years, though I will confess that I did not do all the dropping. I got *dropped* several times myself—doubtless by young women who were looking for a *perfect husband.*

At last I found Mary, who succeeded in disguising and hiding her defects so completely that after two years' courtship *we were married.* I soon found out how deceitful girls (and boys)

can be. I did not express my disappointment; it would have been unwise and unsafe to do so. I did not find the joy and happiness I had anticipated. Why? I can answer now: I was looking for a perfect woman, an *ideal* wife. I got the *real* one; don't you doubt it. I am forty-three years *older* now, and I have learned that there are *no perfect women, no ideal wives,* and *I now declare* that *I would not exchange Mary for any other woman* on earth, *whom I have ever seen or ever expect to see.* She, the mother of my children —Nina, Lela and Minnie; she, who has shared my joys and my sorrows, my laughter and my tears, for more than forty years! I love her more than tongue can tell.

Don't look for perfect men and women; there are none on earth. Sam Jones once said: "There are no perfect men; you are not a perfect man; you never saw a perfect man; you never heard of a perfect man except Jesus Christ. There are no perfect women. You are not a perfect woman, and you never saw, or heard of, a perfect woman. If you ever did, *stand up.*" A long, lean, lank, sallow woman rose to her feet. (It was in Texas.) The great audience looked at her and roared. Jones himself leaned on the pulpit and smiled. The woman stood still. Jones said: "Madam, do you mean to tell this audience that you are a perfect woman?" She replied, in a shrill, but sad, voice: "No, sir, I'm not a perfect woman."

"Well, did you ever see a perfect woman?" "No, sir, I never saw a perfect woman." "Well, did you ever *hear of* a perfect woman?" "Yes, sir, *I heard of one.*" "Well, who was it?" She answered: *"My husband's first wife!"*

Spurgeon says: "A good husband makes a good wife. [My wife has improved greatly since I got her.] Some men can neither do with, nor without, wives—like Tompkins' dog, which could not bear to be loose, and howled when he was tied up. If you catch a tartar, you must take your dose of tartaric acid."

Some men have had wives from whom they might have been Scripturally and legally divorced, but for the sake of the wife herself, or the children, and to prevent disgrace and disaster to the family, they have borne with them, forgiven and protected them. This is still more often the case with wives, who could easily have secured divorces from unfaithful husbands, but who thought it *"better to bear the ills they have, than fly to others they know not of."* I think such a course is oft-times wisest, thoroughly Christian, and best, and I most heartily recommend it.

Some women can forgive all men except their own husbands, and some men can pardon all women except an erring wife, sister or daughter. In God's name, if you can not shelter, forgive and protect your own fallen wife, who do you expect will do so? Do you expect the world to be more

charitable than her own husband, brother or father? I shall never call upon strangers to extend the help which I refuse to give to a sinner in my own house. I do not condone sin, but my own family has the first claim on my *heart* and *hand*, and I have no *charity* for others until my own folks have all the love they need. Thus, let charity *begin* at home, and it will *not end* there either. Love must protect and preserve the home.

There are "*skeletons in the closet*" in many homes, and they should be kept there, and the door forever locked and barred. If you open that door, you disgrace and injure those whom love and duty require you to protect.

"The kindest and the happiest pair
Will find occasion to forbear;
And something every day they live
To pity, and, perhaps, forgive."

—*Cowper.*

"The more we know, the better we forgive;
Whoe'er feels deeply, feels for all who live."

—*Madame de Stael.*

"Good nature and good sense must ever join;
To err is human—to forgive, divine."

—*Alexander Pope.*

Theodore Roosevelt, in his message to Congress in December, 1906, said: "The whole question of marriage and divorce should be relegated to the authority of the National Congress. There is

nothing so vitally essential to the welfare of the nation as the home of the average citizen."

The National Congress of Uniform Divorce agreed on a bill to submit to State Legislatures, granting divorce for six causes; namely, infidelity to marriage vows; felony; bigamy; desertion; habitual drunkenness, and intolerable cruelty.

Most of these should take the form of JUDICIAL SEPARATIONS, in which *re*marriage is forbidden in the decree itself; but always leaving room for *reconciliation* according to 1 Cor. 7:10, 11: "And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband. But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be *reconciled* to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife."

The following beautiful poem was written, at my request, in December, 1917, by Meade E. Dutt, of Tulsa, Okla., for use just here:

TO AN "IDEAL PAIR."

Oh, traveler down Life's long and misty lane,
I pray thee note that chiefest monument—
The first of all by God erected—HOME.
It is a portion of that blessed realm
Where He and all angelic spirits dwell.
No selfish ONE can build it—only TWO
Who in life's bright mid-morn
Have made the great discovery—
Have felt the master bond
That bindeth heart to heart and life to life
For all eternity; and twain one flesh became.

Home! home! It is God's miracle,
His crucible, and yet Love's rose-bower bright;
And into it is poured the mystery
Of Life's unfolding: She for him, and he for her.
Oh, marvelous other-touch! Oh, eye love-lit!
Whose holy fire has never failed
To lighten, symbolize and glorify
The dwelling-place of God in human flesh.

Hail! hail! Thou aged pair whom Love divine
Hath blest and kept until earth's flaming west
Is heaven's east, and day advances swift,
To bid thee pass yon golden portal, where
The King is Love, and hearts shall never change.

XV

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE A FRAUD, AND MRS. EDDY AN "ANTICHRIST"

IN 1866, Mrs. *Mary A. Morse Baker Glover Patterson Eddy* claimed to have *discovered* and *founded* Christian Science. The title is thus carved on her $2,000,000 "Mother Church" in Boston—"THE DISCOVERER AND FOUNDER OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE."

"Christian Science" calls itself "the understanding of God," which is the exact meaning of the Greek word *theosophy,* nor is this the only thing which Mrs. Eddy got from "Madam Blavatsky," for which she failed to give due credit. Mrs. Eddy claims that her book, "Science and Health," contains a new revelation given to her by God. She says: "No human pen or tongue taught me the science contained in this book" ("Science and Health," p. 126, line 30). [Enter ghost of Phinehas Parkhurst Quimby, followed by that of Madam Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott, accompanied by groans from Anna Besant and Catharine Tingley!]

Mrs. Eddy adds that "the Bible has been my only authority." "I have had no other guide in the straight and narrow way of truth." If the Bible was her only guide, how could it have been a "new revelation," God-given in 1866? In the *Arena* of May, 1899 (pp. 556, 557), you will find the proof that she got it from Dr. Phinehas Parkhurst Quimby, of Portland, Maine, about four years before 1866, but as Quimby did not die until January 16, 1866, it was not safe to announce her "*great discovery*" previous to that date.

No exemption from criticism can justly be claimed for Mrs. Eddy on the ground that she was a woman, or because she is *now* dead. Georgine Milne, who wrote the series of articles on "Christian Science" in *McClure's Magazine* in 1907, when criticized for writing only the bad things about Mrs. Eddy, and asked why she had not incorporated such good things as might be said of her, answered that she had searched the whole of Mrs. Eddy's life for a kindly, generous, unselfish, womanly deed, but *had not found one—not one such act in the long life of more than fourscore years.* Her own father (Mark Baker) said: "Mary Magdalene had *seven* devils, but my Mary has *seventy.*" Frederick W. Peabody, of the Boston bar, who knows more about Mrs. Eddy than any other living person, calls her "THE QUEEN OF FRAUDS AND HYPOCRITES" ("Religio-Medical Masquerade," p. 22). Mark Twain says: "Making fun of that

shameless old swindler, Mother Eddy, is the only thing about it I take any interest in. At bottom I suppose I take a private delight in seeing the human race making an ass of itself again, which it has always done whenever it had a chance. That's its affair; it has the right, and it will sweat blood for it centuries hence. See them get down and worship that old creature. A century hence they will all be at it. Sanity in the human race! This is really fulsome."

Mrs. Eddy claims to be the chosen successor to, and equal or superior of, Jesus Christ. In the earlier days she placed her mission above His. She said that the idea God gave her was "higher, clearer, and more permanent" than that given to Jesus. She even points out His shortcomings and limitations. She says: "Our Master healed the sick, practiced Christian healing, and taught the generalities of this divine principle to His students, *but* He left no definite word for demonstrating His principle of healing," and "had wisdom characterized all His sayings, He would not have prophesied His own death and thereby hastened or caused it." Of herself she says: "The works I have written on Christian Science contain absolute truth." What blasphemous presumption!

In the *Christian Science Journal*, April, 1889, Mrs. Eddy has distinctly authorized the claim in her behalf, that she herself was the chosen successor to, and equal of, Jesus Christ. She pro-

mulgated four "Reversible Propositions"; viz., *"God is all;" "God is good, God is mind;" "God is Spirit, being all, nothing is matter;" "Life, God, omnipotent Good, deny death, evil, sin, disease."* Because these make the same sense (?) when read backwards as forward, she *assumes* she has proven their truthfulness, which is about as near as she ever came to proving anything. She says: "I was a scribe under orders, and who can refrain from transcribing what God indites?" Lo! a female popess! Infallibility in Boston, in 1866! and she beat the Pope of Rome to it by four years. He claims to be vicegerent (substitute) for the Son of God, but Mrs. Eddy blasphemously claims superiority to Jesus Christ. The same thing and more of it! (Papal infallibility was decreed by the Vatican Council in 1870.)

Mrs. Eddy was once a Spiritualist medium, and gave seances for money; president of a bogus medical college; an unnatural, unfeeling mother who abandoned her only son, Geo. W. Glover, who is now seventy-three years old, and can not read and write. Her own father said she acted "just like an old ewe-sheep that would not own its lamb." Yet, this is the woman, praised, adored and *thanked* by more than a million dupes for the blasphemous deception she has practiced upon them. Her book called "Science and Health, with Key to the Scriptures," is a plagiarized fake revelation, based upon writings of Dr. P. P. Quimby; this has been abun-

dantly proven again and again. She became a patient of Dr. Quimby in October, 1862. She wrote a poem (?) on the death of Dr. Quimby in 1866, and called it "Lines on the Death of Dr. Quimby, Who Healed the Sick as Did Jesus, in Contradistinction to All 'Isms'." A copy of the poem, in Mrs. Eddy's own handwriting, is now in possession of Mrs. Sarah Crosby, Waterville, Maine. The last two lines read thus:

"Rest should reward him [Quimby] who hath made us whole,
Seeking, tho' tremblers, where his footsteps trod."

Three weeks after she went to Dr. Quimby in 1862, she wrote and published, in the Portland *Evening Courier* of November 7, the following: "Am improving *ad infinitum*. This truth which he opposes to the error of giving intelligence to matter, and placing pain where it never placed itself, if received understandingly, changes the currents of the system to their normal action, and the mechanism of the body goes on undisturbed. That this is a science capable of demonstration, becomes clear to the minds of those patients who reason upon the process of their cure. The truth which he establishes in the patient cures him (although he may be wholly unconscious thereof), and the body, which is full of light, is no longer in disease." Is it any wonder Mrs. Eddy forbids her followers to read or listen to anything against Christian Science? Doesn't such warning look sus-

picious? There is so much truth to condemn it that no one would believe it if he knew all about it.

Just one month after Dr. Quimby's death (February 15, 1866), she wrote a letter to Mr. Julius Dresser, and tried to induce him to step forward into the place Quimby had vacated, and said: "You are more capable of occupying the place than any other I know of." You see at this time she had not contemplated the great "DISCOVERY" which led her later to discredit and slander Dr. Quimby for her own glory and enrichment. Then she speaks of him as a *"vulgar mesmerist"* or *"magnetic healer,"* whose "scribblings" she put into *"grammatical form."* (Shades of Murray and Pineo!) She says: "I used to take his scribblings and fix them over for him, and give him my thoughts and language, which, as I understood it, were far in advance of his."

In 1868, 1869 and 1870, Mrs. Eddy was teaching a system of mental healing which she then said she had learned of Dr. P. P. Quimby. From a comparison of the Quimby-Glover manuscript in the hands of Geo. A. Quimby (son of Dr. Quimby), of Belfast, Maine, Mr. Quimby says: "Having compared it ["Science and Health"] with my father's writings, I find it is a precise copy of them." He further says that an opportunity was afforded Mrs. Eddy to copy his father's writings, as he was accustomed to lend his manuscript to his patients, one of whom was Mrs. Eddy.

The chapter called "Wayside Hints," in the thirty-sixth edition of "Science and Health," was not copied from Quimby's writings. It was written by her literary expert, Jas. Henry Wiggins, a Unitarian minister. He wrote it, she read it in her church as one of her sermons, and then printed it as her own. So says Mr. Peabody, on page 65 of "Religio-medical Masquerade." It doesn't look much like she was "a scribe under orders" in this place, does it? Seems to me it was Jim Henry Wiggins "under orders" from Mrs. Eddy.

You are aware that the *Bible* and "Science and Health" constitute the impersonal pastors of her churches. The sermons consist of alternate passages, read by a so-called First Reader, from "Science and Health," and a so-called Second Reader from the Bible. These lessons are all chosen by a central committee, and these "puppet" readers are not allowed to add one word in explanation of anything. Article IV., Section 6, of her "Rules" reads: "They shall make no remarks explanatory of the lesson sermon at any time during the service." Her book is a senseless jargon, contradicting the Bible, reason and all human experience, and it is self-contradictory in a thousand instances. Christian Science "ordinances" are without "elements," their "prayer-meetings" are without "prayers," and their "preaching" without "sermons or preachers."

Her book has gone through many editions, and many changes, omissions and additions have been made. The chapters have been juggled and rearranged. As a consequence of this, a statement made on a certain page in one edition will be on a different page in some other edition, or may be left out altogether. The first chapter in the seventy-fourth edition of 1893, for instance, is changed to the sixth chapter in the 1909 edition; the second to the seventh; the third to the eighth; the fourth to the ninth; the fifth to the tenth, and many other changes.

If you can not verify a quotation which I may give, in the edition at hand, do not conclude that it is not in her book until you have examined *all* the editions. There is grave reason for doubting a "revelation" as being divine, which has needed so much doctoring, revising and changing as has been given to "Science and Health." This has led some people, who are not afraid to think, to discard the whole thing as a deliberate fraud instead of a divine revelation given to Mrs. Eddy in 1866, or at any other time.

Mrs. Eddy defines Christian (or divine) Science as the "Holy Ghost," which she discovered and founded in 1866 (p. 588, line 7). Amazing! but this conveys no meaning, as the Holy Ghost is as impersonal as her God. You never know what they mean by what they say; they use a "cipher," and such words as God, Christ, Jesus, Holy Ghost,

Scriptures, sin, prayer, atonement, forgiveness, etc., all have given to them special, arbitrary, unique meanings not found in any English dictionary on earth. "Science and Health" is a cryptogram that would tax the genius of an Ignatius Donnelly to unravel.

Here are some of her definitions taken from "Science and Health":

"ADAM: Belief in original sin, sickness and death."

"DEVIL: Belief in sin, sickness and death—animal magnetism."

"MORTAL MIND: Nothing claiming to be something—sin, sickness, death."

"HELL: Sin, sickness and death."

As all of these four words mean *sin, sickness* and *death,* and she says there is no sin, sickness or death, then there is no hell, mortal mind, Adam, or devil!

"FLESH: An error of physical belief, an illusin."

"HOLY GHOST: Christian or Divine Science."

If that is true, how could she have discovered it—the Holy Ghost—in 1866? Blasphemy!

"BAPTISM: Submerge in truth."

"ANGELS: God's thoughts passing through men."

"PURSE: Laying up treasure in matter. Error."

"GIHON (a river): The rights of women acknowledged morally, civilly, socially."

With such definitions of words, a Christian Science breakfast menu should read something as follows:

2 Boiled Ideas—Soft 1 Baked Imagination—Brown
2 Stewed Mistakes
1 Error of Mortal Mind—Broiled Rare
2 Fricasseed Illusions
1 Cup of Nothing Claiming to be Something
Serve hot, with *real cream* and *sugar*

Mrs. Eddy's definition of God is confusion worse confounded. "GOD: The divine principle of all things. Light, love, truth, good, are not attributes of Deity, but the highest terms to express Deity itself. All is mind, and mind is God" ("Science and Health," p. 171). "The principle of divine metaphysics is God. Life is God. God is the supreme Being, the only intelligence of the universe, including man" (p. 226). "God is the principle of man" (p. 466). "Mind is God—man the full representation of mind" (p. 582). "It is as principle, not as person, that he saves man instead of pardons him."

That is pure *atheism.* Thus this Christian Science god is principle, not person, and is identical with *man, mind, nature,* and is the "shadowy result" of mixing Pantheism, Mysticism, Materialism, Transcendentalism, Spiritualism and Hindooism, which is the god of the heathen and not the God of the Bible.

Mrs. Eddy says: "The human family have but one God—one mind; hence man and God are all one." "God is identical with nature in a sense." This reminds me of the infidel's creed: "I believe there is no God, but that matter is God, and God is matter, and it does not matter whether there is any God or not."

Her book is called "Key to the Scriptures," yet it contradicts and flatly denies every cardinal doctrine in the Bible, and she is contradicted by the Bible in everything she teaches in her blasphemous book, as I will now show by drawing

"THE DEADLY PARALLEL."

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.	CHRISTIAN SCIENCE TEACHES
Denies the personality of God.	That God is principle, not person.
Denies that Jesus was the Christ.	That Christ and Jesus were not the same.
Denies the personality of the Holy Ghost.	That Christ always existed, but Jesus was a phantom.
Denies the personality of the Devil.	That Mary gave birth to an idea, not to a babe, in Bethlehem.
Denies that man can sin; that he is ever sick; or that he can die.	That Jesus (the phantom) has disappeared forever.
Denies that matter exists.	That Christ never came in the flesh, and that he is never coming in the flesh.
Denies the reality of sin.	That Christian Science is the Holy Ghost.
Denies there is any such thing as sickness or disease.	That there is no Devil.

Denies that there is any death.	That man never sins; is never sick; never dies.
Denies the atonement.	That man is perfect now, always was, and always will be.
Denies regeneration.	That matter has no existence.
Denies justification.	That evil or sin is a false belief.
Denies sanctification.	That man never fell, can not sin, and never is sick and never dies.
Denies the second coming of Christ.	That the Bible is composed of legends, allegories, fables, myths, and is full of errors and mistakes.
Denies the resurrection of the dead.	That "Science and Health" (Mrs. Eddy's book) is "revealed truth," uncontaminated and free from error, infallible, and is the key to the Scriptures.
Denies the final judgment.	
All of which the Bible affirms.	*All of which the Bible denies.*

NOTE.—The above parallel, with some modifications, is taken from "Leaves of Healing," Vol. XXXVII., No. 3, by permission of Wilbur Glenn Voliva.

Christian Science is so perverse that it *never affirms the truth,* nor *denies a falsehood.* It invariably *denies* the truth and *affirms* the false. Hence it is the very essence of Satanic delusion.

Frederick W. Peabody says: "There has never been a scientifically established Christian Science cure;" "and let me emphasize this statement, there

is not a Christian Science healer, in good and regular standing, in the world, who tells the truth, or tries to tell the truth, or could tell the truth if he tried. They know that suffering is real, they know that disease is real, and they know that death is the most positive of all realities, and yet they perpetually affirm the unreality of these things" ("Religio-medical Masquerade," pp. 114, 115).

THE DEADLY PARALLEL.

The Bible says:

"God created the heavens and the earth."—Gen. 10: 1.

"God formed man out of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life."—Gen. 2: 7.

"My substance was not hid from thee when I was made in secret. Thine eyes did see my substance."—Ps. 130: 15, 16.

OF GOD.

The Bible says:

"Our Father which art in heaven."—Matt. 6: 9.

"And God spake unto Moses and said unto him, I am Jehovah."—Ex. 6: 2.

"Seeing he himself giveth to all life and breath and all things."—Acts 17: 25.

Mrs. Eddy says:

"My first plank in the platform of Christian Science is as follows: 'There is no substance in matter; matter is mortal error; matter is unreal.'"

"Nothing we can say or believe regarding matter is true except that matter is unreal."—"S. and H." (74th Ed., p. 173, 1893).

OF GOD.

"Science and Health" says:

"Father-Mother is the name for deity."—"S. and H." (332-4, 1907 Ed.).

"The Jewish tribal Jehovah was a man-projected God" (140-23).

"God without the image and likeness of Himself would be a nonentity. Spiritual man is the image or idea of God" (320-25).

Of Man.	Of Man.
The Bible says:	"Science and Health" says:
"And God created man in his own image."—Gen. 1: 27-31.	"Harmonious and immortal man has existed forever" (320-15).
"Before Abraham was I am."—John 8: 53.	"In the order of divine Science God and man coexist and are eternal" (p. 336, line 29).
"Therefore as through one man sin entered into the world and death through sin, and so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned."—Rom. 5: 12.	"Never born and never dying, it were impossible for man, under the government of God, in eternal Science to fall from his high estate" (258-27).
Atonement.	Atonement.
The Bible says:	"Science and Health" says:
"Who his own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree."—1 Pet. 2: 24.	"One sacrifice, however great, is insufficient to pay the debt of sin" (23-3).
"Unto him that loved us and loosed us from our sins by his blood."—Rev. 1: 57.	"Paul writes: 'For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the [seeming] death of his Son'" (45-9).
"So Christ was *once* offered to bear the sins of many."—Heb. 9: 26-28.	(She here denies both the death and sacrifice of Christ. His death was only "seeming," and His sacrifice insufficient for sin, for of course there is no such thing as sin!)
"But this man, when he had offered *one sacrifice* for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God."—Heb. 10: 12.	

OF PRAYER.

The Bible says:

"And he spake a parable unto them to this end, that men ought always to pray, and not to faint."—Luke 18: 1.

"I will therefore that men pray everywhere."—1 Tim. 2: 8.

"I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also."—1 Cor. 14: 15.

"Pray without ceasing."—1 Thess. 5: 17.

"Pray one for another."—Jas. 5: 16.

"Pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you."—Matt. 5: 44.

"The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much."—Jas. 5:16.

"Lord, teach us to pray, as John taught his disciples. And he said, When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven."—Luke 11: 1, 2.

"O thou that hearest prayer, unto thee shall all flesh come."—Ps. 65: 2.

"And a man stood before me in bright clothing, which also said, Cornelius, *thy*

OF PRAYER.

Mrs. Eddy says:

"Prayer is useless, and pleading with the divine mind is an error which impedes growth."—"S. and H." (p. 308).

"Petitioning a personal deity is a misapprehension of the sources and means of all blessedness."—Vol. XI. (p. 170).

"Audible prayer to a personal God hinders growth" (pp. 312, 394).

"God is not influenced by man" (p. 7, line 23).

"God is not moved by the breath of praise to do more than he has already done" (2, 8).

"Prayer to a personal God is a hindrance." "Prayer to a corporeal God is useless."—"S. and H." (74th Ed., Index, p. 635).

"The danger from prayer is that it may lead us into temptation."—"S. and H." (p. 7, 1).

Here is Mrs. Eddy's version of the Lord's Prayer, as given in "Science and Health," edition of 1902, first chapter:

prayer is heard, and thine alms are had in remembrance in the sight of God."—Acts 10: 30, 31.

"Watch and *pray,* that ye enter not into temptation."—Matt. 26: 41.

"Our Father-Mother God, all harmonious, adorable One. Thy kingdom is within us, thou art ever present. Enable us to know, as in heaven, so on earth, God is supreme. Give us grace for to-day; feed the famished affections. And infinite love is reflected in love, and love leadeth us not into temptation, but delivereth from sin, disease and death. For God is now and forever all Life, Truth and Love."

OF MIND.

The Bible says:

"For the mind of the flesh is death, but the mind of the Spirit is life and peace."—Rom. 8: 6.

OF MIND.

Mrs. Eddy says:

"Mind is not both good and bad, for God is mind."—"S. and H." (p. 330, line 22).

OF EVIL.

The Bible says:

"But let your speech be Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than this cometh of evil."—Matt. 5: 37.

"Be not overcome of evil, but overcome *evil* with *good.*"—Rom. 12: 21.

"And the Lord said, Behold, the man is become as

OF EVIL.

Mrs. Eddy says:

"Evil is an illusion and error and has no real basis. It is a false belief" (p. 471).

"Evil has no reality—it is neither person, place nor thing, but simply a belief, an illusion of material sense" (71, 1, 3).

"The notion that both evil and good are real is a delu-

one of us to know *good* and *evil.*''—Gen. 3: 23.

sion of material sense'' (330, 25).

''A knowledge of evil was never the essence of divinity or manhood'' (537, 9).

''Matter and evil are unreal.''—Misc. Writings (p. 27).

TIME—AGE.

The Bible says:

''And Noah lived after the flood three hundred and fifty years. And all the days of Noah were nine hundred and fifty years: and he died.''—Gen. 9: 28, 29.

''And when he was twelve years old, they went up to Jerusalem after the custom of the feast.''—Luke 2: 42.

''And all the days of Methuselah were nine hundred sixty and nine years: and he died.''—Gen. 5: 27.

TIME—AGE.

Mrs. Eddy says:

''Never record ages. Chronological data are no part of the vast forever. Time tables of births and deaths are so many conspiracies against manhood and womanhood.''—''S. and H.'' (246, 17).

(She falsified her own age. She gave her age as forty in 1877, when she was in fact fifty-six—only a little slip of sixteen years!)

(It must be a source of deep regret to Christian Scientists that Moses could not have taken counsel of Mrs. Eddy instead of the Lord! and he would have eliminated Chronicles!)

OF BODY, MATTER, SPIRIT.

The Bible says:

''But God giveth it a body as it pleased him, and to each

OF BODY, MATTER, SPIRIT.

Mrs. Eddy says:

''If in the beginning man's body originated in non-intelli-

seed a body of its own."—1 Cor. 15: 38.

"There are also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial."—1 Cor. 15: 40.

"It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body and there is a spiritual body."—1 Cor. 15: 44.

"And the Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground."—Gen. 2: 7.

"For as the body apart from spirit is dead, even so faith apart from works is dead."—Jas. 2: 26.

"Know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you?"—1 Cor. 6: 19.

"And the Word was made *flesh*, and dwelt among us."—John 1: 14.

"Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God; and this is that spirit of *antichrist* whereof ye have heard that it should come."—1 John 4: 3.

"For many deceivers are gone out into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is coming in the flesh. This gent dust, and mind was afterward put into this body by the Creator, why is not the divine order still maintained?" (p. 531, 15).

"What basis is there for the theory of indwelling spirit, except the claim of mortal belief?" (p. 478, 5).

"The conventional firm called matter and mind God never formed" (p. 274, 25).

"The mind supposed to exist in matter, or *beneath a skull bone*, is a myth" (p. 281, 18).

"The mortal body is only an erroneous mortal belief of mind in matter" (p. 372, 2).

"As readily can you mingle fire and frost as spirit and matter" (p. 335, 7).

"Christian Science shows them [the corporeal senses] to be false because matter has no sensation, and no organic construction can give it hearing and sight, nor make it the medium of mind" (p. 489, 2-4).

"Mary's conception of Him [Christ] was spiritual" (p. 228, 1889; p. 332, 1916).

"The Virgin Mother conceived this idea of God, and gave to her idea the name of

is the *deceiver* and the *antichrist.*''—2 John 7.

''Is coming''—Greek, *erkomenon.* (See Jamieson, Fausset & Brown.)

''God was manifest *in the flesh,* justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.''—1 Tim. 2: 16.

Jesus'' (p. 334, 1899; p. 29, 1916).

''Jesus was the offspring of Mary's self-conscious communion with God'' (p. 335, 1899).

''Jesus as material manhood was not Christ.''—Misc. Writings (84, 1916).

''At the time when Jesus felt our infirmities, he had not conquered all the beliefs of the flesh or his sense of material life, nor had he risen to his final demonstration of spiritual power.''—''S. and H.'' (p. 53, 1916; p. 358, 1899).

''To accommodate himself to immature ideas of spiritual power . . . Jesus called the body, which . . . He raised from the grave, 'flesh and bones.''—''S. and H.'' (313, 1909, 1916).

''These instances show the concessions which Jesus was willing to make to popular ignorance.''—''S. and H.'' (p. 398, 1909, 1916).

(All of this is directly contrary to the teaching of the Scriptures, and is a repeated denial of the doctrine that ''Jesus Christ is come in the flesh,'' and is therefore ANTICHRIST!)

OF SIN AND PARDON.

The Bible says:

"If we say we have *no sin*, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us. If we say we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us."—1 John 1: 8-10.

"Our God will abundantly pardon."—Isa. 55: 7.

"Their sins and iniquities will I remember no more."—Heb. 10: 17.

"The blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin."—1 John 1: 7.

"If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just [righteous] to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."—1 John 1: 9.

"Even as the Lord forgave you, even also do ye."—Col. 3: 13.

"Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the *remission of sins*."—Acts 2: 38.

OF SIN AND PARDON.

Mrs. Eddy says:

"Man is incapable of sin, sickness and death" (p. 475, 1916 Ed.).

"Evil is a false belief" (p. 464, 74th Ed., 1893; 476, 1899; 480, 1916).

"It is the sense of sin, and not the sinful soul, which must be lost" (p. 311, 1916).

"To seek salvation through pardon is to misinterpret God."—"S. and H." (p. 181, 1893).

"There is no forgiveness of sin; we must pay the uttermost farthing." "We cannot escape the penalty due to sin." (And yet she says "there is no sin"!)

"God never pardons our sins—sin is not forgiven."—"S. and H." (74th Ed., pp. 310-312, and Vol. II., p. 265).

She says: "The real man cannot depart from holiness, nor can God, by whom man is evolved, engender the capacity or freedom to sin" (p. 475, line 28).

"God, or good, never made man capable of sin" (p. 480, line 19).

MARRIAGE.	MARRIAGE.
The Bible says: "Marriage is honorable in all."—Heb. 13: 4. "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared as with a hot iron; *forbidding to marry,* and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth."—1 Tim. 4: 1-3.	Mrs. Eddy: Mrs Eddy placed a ban on marriage, and said: "It is not good to marry." "Science indicates that celibacy is nearer right than marriage." But she says: "To abolish marriage at this period, and maintain generation, *would put ingenuity to ludicrous shifts,* yet this is possible in Science." "Until time matures human growth, marriage and progeny will continue unprohibited in Christian Science." In her dedication sermon, June, 1906, she denounced marriage as "synonymous with legalized lust." (See *Christian Science Sentinel,* June 16, 1906, and *Christian Science Journal* of July, 1906).
ON SICKNESS, PAIN, DEATH AND THE JUDGMENT.	ON SICKNESS, PAIN, DEATH AND THE JUDGMENT.
The Bible says: "They brought unto him all that were sick."—Mark 1: 3. "Hé healed many that were sick."—Mark 6: 13. "They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick."—Matt. 9: 12.	Mrs. Eddy says: "Man is never sick."—"S. and H" (p. 401). "The sick through belief have induced their own stiff joints and cramped muscles." "Sickness is always hallucination" (p. 406).

"Erastus abode at Corinth, but Trophimus I left at Miletus sick."—2 Tim. 4: 20.

"Jesus went about healing all manner of diseases and all manner of sickness among the people."—Matt. 4: 23.

"And it came to pass in those days that she fell sick and died."—Acts 9: 37.

"But S i m o n's wife's mother lay sick of a fever."—Mark 1: 30.

"They brought unto him all that were diseased, and them that were possessed with devils."—Mark 1: 32.

"Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord."—Rev. 14: 13.

"These all died in faith."—Heb. 11: 13.

"For in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."—1 Cor. 15: 22.

"It is appointed unto man once to die, but after this the judgment."—Heb. 9: 27.

"Then Jesus said unto them plainly, *Lazarus is dead.*"—John 11: 14.

"And as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance and judgment to come, Felix trembled."—Acts 24: 25.

"Argue with the patient that he has no disease. Sickness is a dream from which the patient needs to be awakened" (p. 410).

"The belief that pain and pleasure, life and death, holiness and unholiness mingle in man is a fatal error."—"S. and H." (Ed. 1907, p. 303, line 21).

"We say that man suffers from the effects of cold, heat, fatigue. This is human belief, not the truth of being" (p. 184, 18).

"Man is never sick, for mind is not sick, and matter cannot be" (p. 393, 29).

"What is termed disease does not exist" (p. 188, 3).

"If the body is diseased, this is but one of the beliefs of mortal mind" (p. 425, 14).

"Truth makes no laws to regulate sickness, sin and death, for these are unknown to truth, and should not be recognized as reality" (p. 184, 1).

"The body cannot die." "There is no death." "His disciples believed Jesus dead while he was hidden in the sepulchre, whereas he was

"The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it." "The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it."—Matt. 12: 41, 42.

"When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory," etc.—Matt. 25: 31, 32.

"For we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ."—Rom. 14: 10.

alive."—"S. and H." (pp. 424, 426, 350).

"They saw him after his resurrection and learned he had not died" (p. 46, Ed. 1909).

"Nothing that lives ever dies, and *vice versa*" (p. 374, 29).

(That is what the devil said to Eve in the garden: "Ye shall not surely die." He now uses Mrs. Eddy to affirm it for him.)

"Matter and death are mortal illusions" (289, 29).

"Man is incapable of sin, sickness and death" (475, 28).

"Jesus restored Lazarus by understanding that Lazarus had never died, not by the admission that his body had died and then lived again" (p. 75, 15).

"When you can awaken yourself, or others, out of the belief that all must die, you can then exercise Jesus' spiritual power to reproduce the presence of those who have *thought they died*" (p. 75, 21).

"No final judgment awaits mortals; for the judgment-day of wisdom comes hourly,

> and continually, even the judgment by which mortal man is divested of all material error." (Mrs. Eddy defined "purse," "money," as error.) "As for spiritual error, there is none" (p. 291, 30).

Christian Science wants to be let alone (so did the devils whom Jesus cast out of the man amongst the tombs—Luke 8:28), and its adherents viciously *resent criticism,* and, like Roman Catholicism, the cult refuses either to *hear* or *read* the other side, which is the very essence of *bigotry.*

Eddyism has no standing in logic, science or Christianity. It is infidelity and apostasy. It has no sin, no Saviour, no death, no resurrection, no judgment, no heaven, no hell. It offers but one appeal: *"I have been healed, cured or helped by it."* I do not know of a single *pervert* to Christian Science aside from those who have been influenced by its *healings,* and therefore they have accepted its *irrational, incongruous, contradictory, absurd* and *blasphemous "dogmas"* as "DIVINE TRUTH"; which God (and not Dr. Quimby) revealed to Mary Baker G. Eddy in 1866, and lo, a system of therapeutics becomes a religion!

But where are its hospitals, orphanages, homes for the poor and aged? Ah! there are no sick, no poor, no aged, no orphans! That's all in your

mortal mind, which is defined as "nothing claiming to be something"! But Jesus says: "Ye have the poor with you always" (Mark 14:7).

Mark Twain says: "I have hunted, hunted and hunted, by correspondence and otherwise, and have not yet got upon the track of a farthing that the trust has spent upon any worthy object. Nothing makes a Scientist so uncomfortable as to ask him if he knows of a case where Christian Science has spent money on a benevolence, either among its own adherents or elsewhere. He is obliged to say 'No.' They spend their money for automobiles, fine clothes, jewels and other external marks of *material* prosperity, and in the erection of magnificent temples in which to glorify, praise and extol Mary Baker G. Eddy, the nineteenth-century claimant of infallibility, the 'Feminine Popess' of Boston, Massachusetts."

Christian Science healings do not prove its teachings, for mental healers, faith healers, prayer healers, Mormon healers, Spiritualist healers and Christian Science healers all meet with equal success.

The same class of diseases is cured by all these non-medicated processes; viz., *the functional neuroses.* I have personally tested the effectiveness of such cures in what is known as "The Emmanuel Movement." We could cure Gentile, Jew, pagan or Christian, with or without faith, nor did we ask or expect acceptance of any form of religion be-

cause of the cures performed. But Christian Science will *destroy your faith* in the *essentials of Christianity,* and *damn your soul,* to cure you of some *imaginary disease,* or, at most, a *functional disorder.*

Christian Science is a crazy-quilt, *patterned* by Dr. Quimby, and *pieced* by Mrs. Eddy. The chief puzzle consists in telling where the pieces came from. It is a slumber robe for neurotics, who crawl under it and hypnotize themselves rummaging through its senseless intricacies. The nearer crazy they are to begin with, the greater the likeness, and when *unwisdom* becomes *wisdom,* and the *false* becomes *true,* then *liars* become *prophets, fools* are *philosophers,* and Satan is God.

XVI

THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST AND THE END OF THE WORLD

(Read carefully the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of Matthew.)

TEXT.—"Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye looking into heaven? this Jesus, who was received up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye beheld him going into heaven."—Acts 1: 11—R. V.

I DO not aim to be either dogmatic or sensational, nor have I sought for popularity. Though the above is a very popular subject now, and brings out the largest congregations, it was not so when I first began to preach it. I have not aimed merely to please, but to profit my hearers always. Many will not preach on this subject for fear of criticism both within and without the church. Rev. Mark A. Matthews, of Seattle, the pastor of the largest Presbyterian church in the world, preached, during the spring of 1917, a series of Sunday night sermons on this subject. In one of his introductions he said: "There is no fact that seems to draw out the enmity, anger, hatred and persecution, like

this doctrine of the second coming of Christ. Were it preached as faithfully as it ought to be preached, it would produce indescribable persecutions—not so much from the sin-cursed, unregenerate world, as from the unregenerate part inside the visible church. There are preachers, so-called, who pretend to be ministers of the gospel of Christ, who stand in their pulpits and ridicule the doctrine. I would to God that Jesus would come before I finish."

Two hundred years ago Sir Isaac Newton said: "About the time of the end, in all probability, a body of men will be raised up who will turn their attention to the prophecies, and insist upon their literal interpretation *in the midst of much clamor and opposition.*"

From the days of the apostles, and the declaration of the angels at the ascension of Jesus, His people have looked for, prayed for and hoped for His return. In this connection we have heard much of the millennium, which only means "thousand years."

The second coming of Jesus is mentioned 318 times in the 260 chapters of the New Testament, an average of once in every twenty-five verses. His *first coming* is mentioned 1,585 times in the 829 chapters of the Old Testament, and yet comparatively few were looking for Him when He did come—"He came to his own, and his own received him not." "He is coming a second time without

sin [sin-offering] unto salvation,'' and but few are looking for Him now. I, personally, believe that Jesus will come before the millennium, or one thousand years of peace. I am a Chiliast, or premillenarian. So were Luther, Milton, Newton, Watts, Wesley, Hermas, Justin, and all the martyrs. Amongst the moderns are Spurgeon, Moody, Newman Hall, Arthur T. Pearson, F. B. Meyer, R. A. Torrey, Jas. M. Gray and Billy Sunday, and this was the faith of the primitive church.

Daniel Whitby is responsible for the doctrine of post-millennialism. He taught the people to *spiritualize* everything that offered any difficulty to one's faith from a literal interpretation. This has gone on until it has reached its climax in modern *moonshine exegesis,* in which but one thing is clearly *literal,* and that is *literal unbelief of the word of God! Literal infidelity!* ''There shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation. . . . The Lord is not slack concerning his promises, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein

shall be burned up. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness?" (2 Pet. 3:4-11).

In the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew the disciples (Peter, James, John and Andrew—Mark 13:3), as Jesus sat on the mount of Olives, asked Him three questions just after His prediction of the destruction of Solomon's temple; viz.: (1) Tell us when shall these things be? (2) What shall be the sign of thy coming? and (3) of the end of the world? After a preface extending from the fourth to the fourteenth verses, He tells them: "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world *for a witness unto all nations,* and then shall the *end* [of the Jewish nation] come." The end of the Jewish nation was, of course, simultaneous with the destruction of the temple, which took place in the year 70 A. D., under Titus. A graphic description of the siege and fall of Jerusalem is given by the Master from the fifteenth to the twenty-second verses. He first tells His disciples when to "flee into the mountains"—when they should see the "abomination of desolation stand in the holy place"—and thus escape the horrors of the awful "tribulation." They watched for that sign, and, after the Roman army had encompassed the city, they fled to the mountains. Josephus says: "Cestius Gallius, after beginning the siege, mysteriously withdrew, without any reason in the world, and

many [the disciples] embraced this opportunity to depart: a great multitude fled to the mountains." He also tells us that 1,356,460 perished in the siege, and 101,700 were sold into slavery. That siege only lasted five months, from April 14 to September 8. If it had continued into the winter, the disciples in the mountains would have perished from cold and hunger, "but for the elect's [the disciples] sake, those days shall be shortened." Jesus warned them not to expect His coming at that time (vs. 23-28).

After thus answering their first question, He proceeds to the second: "What shall be the *sign* of thy coming?" In the twenty-ninth verse He tells them of the apostasy that should come, and then tells of the *sign* of His coming, and not of His coming. "Then shall appear the *sign* of the Son of man in heaven: . . . and he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." This is the *rapture,* or "first resurrection," which takes place before He comes to earth to establish His millennial kingdom, at which time He brings all those elect ones back with Him, and they live and reign with Him a thousand years. This is the "*fig-tree sign.*" The first resurrection bears the same relation to His coming that the tender leaves of the budding fig-tree do to the approaching summer.

Before giving His answer to the third question, He exhorts them, and every one, to be prepared for the *sign* (first resurrection) of His coming. The record is found from the thirty-fourth verse of the twenty-fourth chapter, to the thirty-first verse of the twenty-fifth chapter, all of which is a postlude to the second question, including the parable of the ten virgins, and the parable of the talents. He also tells them that "this generation [meaning the *generation of Abraham, the Jews*] shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled." This marvelous prediction has been amazingly fulfilled in the preservation of the Jews as the most separate and distinct people on earth, and yet they have had neither king nor country of their own for over eighteen hundred years.

He now comes to the third question, "the end of the world?" As they only asked for the *sign* of His coming, and not of His *coming* itself, He passes over the millennial reign of one thousand years, and tells of the end of the world from the thirty-first verse to the end of the twenty-fifth chapter. He tells of the judgment: "And before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them from one another as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats. . . . And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal."

Much of the Bible has a figurative meaning. Jesus taught largely by parables, but it is not all

figurative. The following must be taken as literal: Luke 1:31-33. The angel Gabriel said to Mary: "And, behold, thou shalt conceive and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Most High." All agree that the above is *literal,* because it is fulfilled; but the next two statements some think must be figurative, but they are just as *literal* as the first, only they remain to be fulfilled in the near future. "And the Lord shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever [or Greek, "unto the ages;" that is, for one thousand years]; and of his kingdom there shall be no end," but He will "deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power" (1 Cor. 15:24). "And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all" (1 Cor. 15:28).

When Jesus comes He will destroy that "wicked" (one) antichrist, the man of sin, with the "spirit of his mouth," and the "brightness of his coming" (2 Thess. 2:8). As antichrist does not arise after the millennium, and Christ destroys him when he comes, Christ's coming must of necessity be *before* the millennium.

Again, the righteous are raised from amongst the dead at His appearing (in the clouds), and

He brings them back with Him when He comes, and they live and reign with Him a thousand years, hence He comes before the millennium.

Here are the three great literal facts: (1) Jesus has been on this earth; (2) He is now at the right hand of God, making intercession for us; (3) He is coming again.

Heb. 9:24-28: "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year [on the day of atonement annually] with the blood of others [animals]; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world [end of the Jewish nation] hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. . . . So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin [a sin-offering—Greek] unto salvation."

In the partaking of the Lord's Supper we show our hope of His second coming, and thus *preach* it to others. Jesus says: "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom" (Matt. 26:29). "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do show [proclaim—R. V.] the Lord's death *till he come.*"

All of God's dealing with man has been, and still is, a matter of government. Religion is rule—the rule of God. Man is a finite being with infinite interests, and only infinite power, wisdom and goodness can properly conserve and direct the affairs of mankind.

Man has tried to govern himself ever since his fall, and God has allowed him six thousand years of unsuccessful trial and experiment in the way of self-government, only *suggesting* to him, but not compelling him. But it has all resulted in failure, humiliation and disaster. I do not know how much longer the trial is to continue, but I *do* know that it will all result in *failure!* Man can not successfully govern the world. The patriarchal government from Adam to Moses failed. The Mosaic government was a failure, and passed away. Then came Cæsar and the Roman Government, and Rome declined and fell, and we have the decimated "ten-toed" successor of the Roman Empire to-day, and the recent world war proved it the greatest failure of them all! Why? Because all the past forms of world government have been based upon the wrong principle. They have been based upon *power* and *authority*, either *assumed* or *delegated*. *Assumed* as in Prussia—*delegated* as in the United States.

These must and will give way to the reign of Jesus Christ, which will be successful, and will never be destroyed. "Of his kingdom there shall

be no end." "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed" (Dan. 2:44, 45). This is the "stone kingdom" or fifth great kingdom—"the stone cut out of the mountain without hands which smites the image [world government] upon its feet, that were of iron and clay." "Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver and the gold broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them; and the stone [Christ's kingdom] became a great mountain [government] and filled the whole earth" (Dan. 2:34, 35).

Christ's kingdom is founded on *love,* and love is the only power that can ever successfully govern the world, or the individual man. The Jews tried law plus religion; the Greeks tried culture and art; the Romans tried force—*all failed.* The Jew has been scattered to the four winds of heaven, and oppressed, for two thousand years. The Greek, who polished the brains of the world, now polishes shoes. "How are the mighty fallen!"

General Bertrand asked Napoleon: "How can you believe in Jesus Christ?" Napoleon replied: "I know men, and I tell you that Jesus is not a man. Alexander, Cæsar, Charlemagne and myself founded empires upon *force.* But Jesus Christ founded an empire upon *love;* and at this hour millions of men would die for Him. I die before

my time, and my body will be given back to earth to become food for worms. Such is the fate of him who has been called 'the great Napoleon.' What an abyss between my deep misery and the eternal kingdom of Christ, which is proclaimed, loved, adored, and is still existing over the whole earth." Then, turning to General Bertrand, the Emperor added: "Sir, if you do not perceive that Jesus Christ is God, then I did wrong in appointing you a general."

The great, golden-headed *image* of earthly governments will all fail and pass away. The *passing* of the very *toes* of that image is now staged upon the earth.

The church is Christ's kingdom in preparation. Only those who are willing to be ruled by *love* ever can get into the church, and if they continue to be ruled thus to the end, they "fall asleep in Jesus," and when the first resurrection comes all such will be raised and go (with the living saints) up to meet Him in the air, and will return with Him when He comes back, and rule and reign with Him in His kingdom for a thousand years—a millennium.

1 Cor. 15:19-26: "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable. But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man

in his own *order* [band—Greek]: Christ the first-fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming [in the clouds—the rapture, or first resurrection]. Then cometh the end [or resurrection of the wicked] when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."

1 Cor. 15:28: "And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all."

1 Thess. 4:13-18: "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them that are asleep [in Jesus], that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also *which sleep in Jesus* will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent [go before, or ahead of] them which are asleep [in Jesus]. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise *first*: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever [after that] be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words."

1 Cor. 15:51, 52: "Behold, I shew you a mystery; We shall not all sleep [in Jesus; that is, *shall not all die*], but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed."

Are you ready for the coming of the Lord? Watch! "Then shall two be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left. Two grinding at the mill; the one shall be taken, and the other left. Watch therefore: for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come" (Matt. 24:40-42).

Rev. 20:4-15: "And I saw thrones, and they that sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." This describes the one thousand years' reign of Jesus and those that are *ruling* with him—just those that had part in the first resurrection. "But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand

years" (verses 5 and 6. During that time Satan is bound in the bottomless pit). "And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea."

And now we have a description of the last attempt to use *force* in the control of the world. "And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city [Jerusalem]: and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them. And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast [the Papacy] and the false prophet [Mohammedanism] are [and had been there for one thousand years, and now the devil, which is paganism, is cast into the same place], and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever." Now Jesus has overcome all enemies except death, and he now overcomes that by immediately raising the balance of the dead, *the wicked,* and the judgment is set.

"And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books [Old and New Testaments] were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life [your life and mine]: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books [Old and New Testaments], according to their works [lives]."

"And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and the grave [Hades] delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged every man according to their works. And *death* and the *grave* [or those who were therein] were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire" (Rev. 20:15).

I have always been passionately fond of a copious spring. To me it is the fittest emblem of the goodness of God. Ever flowing, sparkling, refreshing and life-sustaining, from a source unseen, but never ceasing. So is the sweet, unfailing love and mercy of our heavenly Father.

SOME QUESTIONS ASKED AND ANSWERED IN REVIVAL MEETINGS

QUESTION. Why do you call yourselves Christians?

ANSWER. Because we *are* Christians, and an authorized name is better than an unauthorized one, a Scriptural name is safer than an unscriptural one.

Q. Why do you preach baptism so much?

A. To induce you to practice it more, and to overcome the great amount of preaching and prejudice against this ordinance of our Lord.

Q. Is there probation beyond this life?

A. If so, I do not know it, but I know there is probation now, and I shall not neglect a certainty for a doubtful contingency.

Q. I have heard that your church has a creed, though you deny it. Will you please tell us the truth about it?

A. Yes, we have a creed. It is the Bible, especially the New Testament. We make war on all human creeds, and we believe them to be schismatical and inimical to Christian union.

Q. If God is omnipotent, why don't He kill the devil?

A. That would make an orphan out of you. John 8:44: "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father it is your will to do" (R. V.). And again, why kill the leader and not kill his followers? That would catch you again! Besides, we must overcome evil of good, and not by killing devils, big or little.

Q. Do you believe in the eternal punishment of the wicked?

A. Just as certainly as I believe in the eternal reward of the righteous.

Q. Why don't you baptize infants?

A. Because there is neither precept nor example, reason nor revelation for it.

Q. Where did Cain get his wife?

A. Doubtless where husbands were scarce, else she would have made a better choice! And there are others. When serious, sensible (?) people ask this question, we give a serious answer by referring them to Gen. 5:4, and informing them that events are not given here in their exact chronological order.

S. M. MARTIN.

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: April 2006

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 017 660 019 6